

- - - - - ACADEMIC CALENDAR SURVEY - - - - -

This is a reminder for you to complete and return
the Academic Calendar Survey by Wednesday, April 2.

If you did not receive one or misplaced your copy,
please call Darwin Hendel or Jeanne Solberg
(3-5819) to receive another copy.

University Senate Clerk
424 Morrill Hall

INSERT:

What Reasons Did Faculty State as the Basis for Their Opinions?

Faculty members were invited to comment on the nature of their preferences (e.g., quarter system, semester system, or no preference). Of the total group of 1,727 faculty responses, 856 (49.6%) commented about the basis for their preference. Not surprisingly, there were differences in the frequency of comments that related to preferences: 47.7 percent (N = 411) of those who favored the quarter system commented, 55.5 percent (N = 445) who favored the semester system commented, and 41.9 percent (N = 95) who had no preference commented.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Clerk of the Senate
424 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2125

Feb. 25, 1986

yes Vice Chancellor Elizabeth Blake, 313 Behmler Hall, Morris campus

yes Vice Chancellor Donald Harriss, 420 Darland Adm. Bldg., Duluth campus

yes Vice Chancellor Thomas Lindahl, Administration Bldg., Waseca campus

no Vice Chancellor Rita Meyer, 302 Selvig Hall, Crookston campus

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly has approved a motion to submit the question of change to a semester system to a vote of all regular faculty members on the Twin Cities campus "with the courtesy of a referendum being extended to the regular faculty members of the coordinate campuses."

Enclosed is a copy of the survey being sent to regular faculty members on this campus. If you choose to participate, you will want to modify it to fit your campus before sending it out.

Marilee Ward, Assembly Clerk

encl.

cc: Professor Deon Stuthman, Chr., Steering Committee
Chancellor Edward Frederick
Chancellor Robert Heller
Chancellor John Imholte
Chancellor Donald Sargeant

Morris

SUMMARY REPORT OF
FACULTY VIEWS CONCERNING THE PROPOSAL
TO CHANGE TO THE SEMESTER SYSTEM
ON THE MORRIS CAMPUS

Darwin D. Hendel, Jeanne Solberg, and Susan Urahn

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Minnesota

May 2, 1986

One of the recommendations in the Final Report of the Task Force on the Student Experience (July 13, 1984) was as follows:

The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs should initiate studies to identify the most effective learning strategies for lower division students.

Among the several suggested actions associated with this recommendation was that the University should "consider implementing the semester system to facilitate more intensive study in particular course areas."

Subsequently, President Keller appointed the Semester Working Group, chaired by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett, to study the implications of changing to the semester system. Since the Semester Working Group submitted its report in April 1985, there have been discussions in the University Senate and elsewhere about the proposed change. Although the Senate made no formal recommendations about the proposed change, it did recommend that a formal survey of faculty opinion be undertaken prior to further actions on the proposed change. The study described in this report was conducted to respond to the Senate's recommendation for further information describing faculty opinions about the proposed change.

This report summarizes the results of distributing a survey on the Morris campus. Other parallel reports summarize similar results for the University's other campuses that conducted faculty opinion studies on their campuses. The following six questions serve as the outline for discussing the survey process and its results:

- o How was the survey designed and who was surveyed?
- o Who responded to the Academic Calendar Questionnaire?
- o How familiar were faculty with the work of the Semester Working Group?
- o What were faculty preferences regarding the proposed change to the semester system?
- o What were the correlates of faculty opinions? and
- o What reasons did faculty state as the basis for their opinions?

How Was the Survey Designed and Who Was Surveyed?

The Academic Calendar Questionnaire was designed to achieve three purposes: a) to obtain faculty preferences for the quarter versus semester systems and related aspects of the proposed change to the semester system; b) to collect faculty descriptive data (e.g., teaching responsibilities, college of appointment, and sabbatical experiences) that might relate to their preferences; and c) to allow faculty to explain the basis for their preferences. These three purposes guided the development of a short

questionnaire with appropriate questions for each of the three purposes noted above.

A draft version of the questionnaire was prepared after an initial meeting with faculty members on the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA). SCFA reviewed the draft and suggested some modifications in content before a final version was prepared. At that time, a copy of the questionnaire was sent to the chancellors of each of the other four campuses to invite their campuses to participate in a parallel study if they wished to do so. Appendix A contains a copy of the survey used on the Morris campus. Appendix B-1 contains an overview of the results of the survey for all campuses of the University.

Additional discussions in SCFA and the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs concerned the target population of potential faculty respondents. The decision was made that only regular faculty (i.e., tenured and tenure-track) should be surveyed since they would be most affected by a decision to change to the semester system. The survey was sent to the 94 regular faculty on the Morris campus. In the accompanying cover letter, signed by Chancellor Imholte, faculty were asked to return their completed surveys to the Morris campus. When the data analysis began, 60 questionnaires had been returned, representing 71.4 percent of the regular faculty on the Morris campus. The results described on the following pages are based on the 60 completed questionnaires received as of April 14, 1986.

Who Responded to the Academic Calendar Questionnaire?

Completed questionnaires were received from 60 faculty (71.4 percent of those who were sent surveys in February 1986). In addition to the primary preference questions on the Academic Calendar Questionnaire, it contained several questions to be used in determining correlates of faculty opinion. Of the faculty respondents, 26.7 percent were assistant professors, 31.7 percent were associate professors, and 31.7 percent were professors. Tables 1, 2, and 3 contain the descriptive statistics for each of the items used in the analysis of factors contributing to faculty members' opinions about the proposed change to the semester system. Since those items are important for this report only insofar as they relate to opinions about the proposed change to the semester system, they are not discussed here.

How Familiar Were Faculty with the Report of the Semester Working Group?

One set of questions on the survey asked faculty to indicate their familiarity with the report of the Semester Working Group. The results are as follows:

- o 60.0 percent of the faculty respondents were aware of the report;
- o 15.0 percent had seen the report;
- o 25.0 percent of the faculty had read the report; and
- o 33.3 percent had talked with colleagues about the report.

A subsequent section of this report addresses the relationship between responses to the above questions and opinions about the proposed change to the semester system.

What Were Faculty Preferences Regarding the Proposed Change?

Although previous surveys on the topic asked for opinions about numerous starting and beginning dates, the intent of this survey was to focus on the distinction between the quarter versus semester system with some constraints (e.g., that the fall semester begin after Labor Day and end before the holidays). Only two questions were included in the present study:

- o Given your values, beliefs, and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better for the Morris campus? and
- o Should the Morris campus of the University of Minnesota change its current three-quarter system to a semester system, with fall semester beginning immediately after Labor Day?

The frequencies and percentages in Table 4 indicate faculty members' responses to each of the above two questions. For the first question, half (50.0%) preferred the semester, 38.3 percent preferred the quarter, and 10.0 percent had no preference. In the second question in which faculty were asked to indicate whether or not the change to the semester system should be made, 51.7 percent said "yes," 46.7 percent said "no," and another 1.7 percent did not respond.

In addition to the above questions, faculty who preferred to change to the semester system were asked to indicate their preferences for the spring semester starting and ending dates as well as a feasible target date for making the change. Table 5 indicates faculty members' responses concerning these scheduling issues if the proposed change to the semester system is made.

What Were the Correlates of Faculty Opinions?

As noted previously, the remaining questions on the survey were included to determine if faculty characteristics related to their preferences for the quarter versus the semester system. Some items (e.g., college) were included because of clear expectations that differences existed among collegiate units, whereas other items (e.g., gender and sabbatical experience) were included because of less obvious expectations.

The analysis related each of the faculty characteristics to the two criterion questions (i.e., preference for the quarter, preference for the semester, or no preference, and whether or not the Twin Cities campus should change to the semester system) using either chi-square analyses for categorical variables (e.g., gender) or t-tests or analysis of variance for continuous variables (e.g., years at the University). The following summary indicates whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship

between the characteristic and responses to the two questions, and if so, the nature of the difference.

- o College of appointment was significantly related to both the preference ($X^2 = 15.46$, $p < .05$). The results in Table 6 indicate the collegiate percentages in each response category for the two questions.
- o The comparison between tenured and tenure-track faculty indicated no differences in preference.
- o The results indicated no statistically significant difference in preference among ranks.
- o Among the five primary role groups, there was not a statistically significant differences for the preference question.
- o The comparisons for years on the faculty at the University of Minnesota indicated no statistically significant difference.
- o There were no gender differences in the preference question.

What Reasons Did Faculty State as the Basis for Their Opinions?

Faculty were invited to comment on the nature of their preferences (e.g., quarter system, semester system, or no preference). Of the total group of 60 faculty responses, 42 (70.0%) commented about the basis for their preference. The analysis of the diverse and sometimes extensive comments focused on particular issues and concerns expressed, rather than on the most strongly and consistently expressed concerns of a particular faculty member. Hence, each of the several specific issues noted were tabulated for each faculty member since most of the comments were multidimensional in content. The frequencies and percentages in Tables 8 and 9, respectively, describe the basis for preferring the quarter system or the semester system.

TABLE 1

Descriptive Characteristics of Morris Campus Faculty
Who Completed the Academic Calendar Questionnaire

QUESTION RESPONSE	N ^a	%
UNIT	<u>60</u>	
Education	8	13.3
Humanities	22	36.7
Science and Mathematics	14	23.3
Social Sciences	13	21.7
Other	3	5.0
<u>Tenure Status</u>	<u>60</u>	
Tenure-track	16	26.7
Tenured	44	73.3
<u>Rank</u>	<u>60</u>	
Instructor	6	10.0
Assistant Professor	16	26.7
Associate Professor	19	31.7
Professor	19	31.7
Other	--	----
<u>Gender</u>	<u>60</u>	
Female	12	20.0
Male	48	80.0
<u>Years on University Faculty^b</u>	<u>60</u>	
6 years or less	14	23.7
7-15 years	17	28.8
16-20 years	12	20.4
21 years or more	16	27.1

^a Where the numbers do not sum to 60, the remainder represents missing data for that item.

^b The mean was 13.92 (SD = 8.55), with a median of 14.75 and a mode of 25 years.

TABLE 2

Prior Experiences with the Quarter and Semester Systems
for Morris Campus Faculty
Who Completed the Academic Calendar Questionnaire

Prior Experience	Type of System ^a					
	Quarter System		Semester System		Other System	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
As an undergraduate	19	31.7	43	71.7	3	5.0
As a graduate school/professional school student	33	55.0	42	70.0	1	1.7
As a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota	13	21.7	23	38.3	3	5.0

^a Percentages sum to greater than 100 since faculty may have had prior experience with more than one type of system.

TABLE 3

Current Instructional Responsibilities
and Professional Development Activities
of Morris Campus Faculty
Who Completed the Academic Calendar Questionnaire

QUESTION RESPONSE	N	%	x	Median
Current Role	<u>60^a</u>			
Primarily involved in teaching	32	54.2		
Primarily involved in research	2	3.4		
Equally involved in teaching and research	18	30.5		
Discipline-related service	1	1.7		
University service and administration	6	10.2		
Courses Taught (1985-86)				
Day-school courses			5.40	5.67
Summer Sessions I and II			.18	.10
CEE			.15	.04
Other Activities/Responsibilities				
Field work off campus	9	15.0		
Non-University consulting	2	3.3		
Teaching clinical courses	2	3.3		
Clinical responsibilities to patients	1	1.7		
Professional Development Experiences				
Single quarter leave	35	58.3		
Sabbatical	26	43.3		
Unpaid leave of absence	12	20.0		
Released time on external grant	4	6.7		

^a Where the numbers do not sum to 60, the remainder represents missing information.

TABLE 4

Morris Campus Faculty Members' Opinions
about the Quarter and Semester Systems

QUESTION RESPONSE	N	%
Preference	<u>60</u>	
Quarter system	23	38.3
Semester system	30	50.0
Both options equal	6	10.0
No response	1	1.7
Change to Semester System	<u>60</u>	
Yes	31	51.7
No	28	46.7
No response	1	1.7

TABLE 5

Morris Campus Faculty Members' Preferences
for Spring Semester Starting Date
and Implementation Date

Question	N	%
Spring Semester Starting Date	<u>30</u>	
Early in and early out (e.g., begin in early January and end in mid-May)	21	70.0
Late in and late out (e.g., begin in late January and end in June)	5	16.7
No preference	4	13.3
Change Implementation Date	<u>33</u>	
1986	2	6.1
1987	11	33.3
1988	16	48.5
1989	2	6.1
1990	1	3.0
1991 or later	1	3.0

TABLE 6
 Comparisons among Units in Faculty Members'
 Preferences and Change Responses

Unit	Preference		
	<u>Quarter</u> %	<u>Semester</u> %	<u>Equal</u> %
Education	62.5	37.5	----
Humanities	28.6	66.7	4.8
Science and Mathematics	50.0	21.4	28.6
Social Sciences	53.8	46.2	----
Other	66.7	33.3	----

TABLE 7
Content Analysis of Faculty Members' Stated Reasons
for Preferring the Quarter System^a

Category	Total Number of Comments	Percent of Total Comments
	<u>25</u>	
More courses possible and/or greater variety	5	20.0
Better curriculum options, more variety and diversity	3	12.0
Tradition	3	12.0
Concentrates efforts for students	3	12.0
More options possible to give greater program flexibility	2	8.0
Time frame is good for my courses/programs	1	4.0
More flexibility for students	1	4.0
Enables single quarter leaves and leaves of absence	1	4.0
Convenient spacing in terms of seasons and holidays	1	4.0
No evidence that semester is better educationally	1	4.0
System works fine so why change	1	4.0
More flexibility in teaching loads	1	4.0
Too much disruption in making the change	1	4.0
Students exposed to varied instructors	1	4.0
Need to be same as Twin Cities	1	4.0

^a Three of these noted the importance of this for a small campus.

TABLE 8
 Content Analysis of Faculty Members' Stated Reasons
 for Preferring the Semester System^a

Category	Total Number of Comments	Percent of Total Comments
	<u>41</u>	
More relaxed, less hurried, and less pressured	6	14.6
Greater depth possible	4	9.8
Less paper work (registration, grading, exams)	4	9.8
More time to develop topics adequately	4	9.8
More time for students to do research, writing, and projects	3	7.3
Better pedagogically, better learning	3	7.3
More time to assimilate ideas and concepts	3	7.3
Be done earlier in spring for jobs, field work	3	7.3
More time for faculty research	2	4.9
Quarter too short to teach classes effectively	1	2.4
Reduces "start-up" time	1	2.4
More in accord with other institutions	1	2.4
Better chance to get to know students	1	2.4
Preference is very slight	1	2.4
Less sense of rushing through topics	1	2.4
More structured for students	1	2.4
Need to be same as the Twin Cities	1	2.4
More time for summer research	1	2.4



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MORRIS

Office of the Provost
Morris, Minnesota 56267

Dear Colleague:

An All-University Semester Working Group dealing with how a transition from a quarter to a semester system could be accomplished, finished its work last April. The Working Group did not determine whether a change should be made, but only if a change were made, how it would be carried out.

Now the University Senate has decided that a survey should be conducted on the Twin Cities campus to determine whether faculty favor or oppose a change from a quarter to a semester system. The courtesy of a similar referendum has been extended to faculty members on the out state campuses as well.

I believe we should participate in this survey. It will provide us with a current, informed response to whatever action the Twin Cities Campus Assembly may take on the matter. The attached questionnaire is identical to that being used by the Twin Cities campus faculty with the exception of substituting "UMM" for "Twin Cities campus" and a modification of item 6 where UMM divisions have been substituted for Twin Cities campus colleges, schools, and programs.

The survey is being sent to all regular faculty members on the Morris campus. Since possible change to the semester system will affect the lives of all faculty, it is extremely important that you voice your opinion about the semester vs. quarter systems. The survey takes only a few minutes to complete. A nearly 100% return is essential for the response to be accurate. Please fill it out and do not fold it. Return it to Pat Tanner in the chancellor's office by Monday, March 31, 1986. If you have any questions about the survey, please call either myself (x6020) or Steve Granger (x6025). The results will be made known as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "John Q. Imholte".

John Q. Imholte
Chancellor

pt

Enc.

ACADEMIC CALENDAR QUESTIONNAIRE

This brief questionnaire asks you for your opinion concerning the proposed change from the quarter system to the semester system on the Morris campus of the University of Minnesota.

SECTION I: Opinions about the Quarter and Semester Systems

There are two basic related questions concerning the quarter system versus the semester system:

- the first question below asks you to indicate your opinion as to which of the two options is better, but does not ask you to address whether or not the University should change from the quarter to the semester system.
- the second question asks you if you think a change should be made from the quarter to the semester system on the Morris campus.

1. Given your values, beliefs, and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better for the Morris campus? (Check one)

- (1) Quarter system
- (2) Semester system
- (3) the two options are equal for me

Please comment: _____

2. Now consider whether or not the Morris campus of the University of Minnesota should change its current three-quarter system, with fall quarter beginning in late September, to a semester system, with fall semester beginning immediately after Labor Day? (Check one)

- (1) No, retain the current system with fall quarter beginning in late September and with spring quarter ending in mid-June. If "No," please go to Section II below.
- (2) Yes, change to the semester system with fall semester beginning very soon after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21. If "Yes," please go to Section III below.

SECTION II: Prefer to Retain the Current Quarter System

This section is for faculty who prefer to retain the current quarter system.

3. What is your major objection to changing to the semester system as described above?

SECTION III: Prefer Change to the Semester System

This section is for faculty who prefer to change to the semester system with fall term beginning immediately after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21.

4. Although there is no flexibility in the starting date for the fall semester, there are several options for the spring semester. Please indicate your preference from the options listed below:
- ___ (1) Early in and early out (e.g., begin spring semester in early January and end it in mid-May)
- ___ (2) Late in and late out (e.g., begin spring semester in late January and end it in mid-June)
- ___ (3) No preference as to starting and ending dates for spring semester
5. If the decision is made in the next few months to change to the semester system, when do you think it is feasible to make the change?

Fall semester 19___

SECTION IV: Faculty Characteristics

Your answers to this set of questions will help us understand the differences of opinion that exist concerning the quarter versus semester systems.

6. What is your division? (check one)

(1) Education

(2) Humanities

(3) Science & Mathematics

(4) Social Sciences

(5) Other Unit (please specify): _____

7. Tenure status?

(1) Tenure-track position

(2) Tenured

8. Rank?

(1) Instructor

(2) Assistant Professor

(3) Associate Professor

(4) Professor

(5) Other (please specify): _____

9. Gender?

(1) Female

(2) Male

10. How many years have you been a faculty member at the University of Minnesota, Morris?

___ years

11. What experiences have you had with the quarter and semester? For each of the following, indicate the academic calendar you experienced. (Circle all of the following that apply.)

	Not Applicable	Quarter System	Semester System	Other System
a. As an undergraduate	9	1	(1)	1
b. As a graduate school/ professional school student	9	1	(1)	1
c. As a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota	9	1	(1)	1

12. What professional development experiences have you had while on the faculty of the University of Minnesota, Morris? (Check all that apply.)

- ___ (1) Single quarter leave
 ___ (1) Sabbatical
 ___ (1) Unpaid leave of absence
 ___ (1) Released time on external grant

13. For the current year (i.e., Summer Session I, 1985, through Spring Quarter, 1986) how many courses did you teach in each of the following categories?

	Number
a. Total day-school courses across fall, winter, and spring quarters	___
b. Total courses in Summer Sessions I & II	___
c. Total credit courses offered through Continuing Education & Extension from SSI 1985 through Spring Quarter 1986	___

14. How would you describe your current activities at the University? Please check the one category that best describes your role.

- ___ (1) Primarily involved in teaching
 ___ (2) Primarily involved in research
 ___ (3) Equally involved in teaching and research
 ___ (4) Discipline-related service
 ___ (5) University service and administration

15. The following items describe activities and responsibilities that may relate to faculty preferences for the quarter versus the semester system. (Check all of the following that apply.)

- (1) Field work that takes me away from campus for a week or more during fall, winter, and/or spring quarters
- (1) Non-University consulting of approximately one day per week
- (1) Responsibility for the teaching of clinical courses
- (1) Clinical responsibilities to patients as clients served by the University

16. The Semester Working Group, chaired by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett, submitted its report in April, 1985, concerning changing to the semester system. Indicate your familiarity with their work by checking all of the following that apply.

- (1) Was aware of the report before now
- (1) Have seen the report
- (1) Have read the report.
- (1) Have talked about the report with colleagues

---Thank you for your time and cooperation---

PLEASE DO NOT FOLD. RETURN YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY BY MARCH 31 TO:

Pat Tanner
Office of the Chancellor
UMM

APPENDIX TABLE B-1

Comparison among Twin Cities, Duluth, and Morris Faculty
on Primary Questions on the Academic Calendar Survey

QUESTION RESPONSE	Twin Cities ^a		Duluth ^b		Morris ^c	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
System preference	<u>1,727</u>		<u>182</u>		<u>60</u>	
Quarter	861	49.9	69	37.9	27	45.0
Semester	613	35.5	93	51.1	27	45.0
No preference	227	13.1	18	9.9	3	8.3
No response	26	1.5	2	1.1	1	1.7
Prefer change to semester	<u>1,727</u>		<u>182</u>		<u>60</u>	
Yes	676	39.1	103	56.6	31	51.7
No	931	53.9	73	40.1	28	46.7
No response	120	6.9	6	3.3	1	1.7

^a The survey was sent in February 1986 to the 2,722 regular faculty (tenured and tenure-track) on the Twin Cities campus asking for a response by March 12, 1986. A postcard reminder was sent a week later to the non-respondents asking them to respond by April 2. Because of the large number (about 100) of faculty who called to say they had not received the original survey, the return deadline was set at April 14, at which time 1,727 (63.5%) had been returned.

^b The survey and cover letter signed by Chancellor Heller were sent on February 28, 1986 to all faculty on the Duluth campus. A total of 182 questionnaires were forwarded for analysis, representing a response rate of 45.7 percent.

^c The survey and cover letter signed by Chancellor Imholte were sent to the 84 regular faculty on the Morris campus. Of those, 60 (71.4%) were returned.

U M M

7 April 1986

MEMO TO: Marilee Ward

FROM: Jack Imholte, Chancellor, UMM

SUBJECT: Results of Academic Calendar Questionnaire

Enclosed you will find the Academic Calendar Questionnaires returned by faculty members at UMM. The questionnaires were sent to 84 faculty members, a total of 60 or 71% responded. If you have questions, the person to contact here is Steve Granger.

pt

Enc.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MORRIS

Office of the Provost
Morris, Minnesota 56267

Dear Colleague:

An All-University Semester Working Group dealing with how a transition from a quarter to a semester system could be accomplished, finished its work last April. The Working Group did not determine whether a change should be made, but only if a change were made, how it would be carried out.

Now the University Senate has decided that a survey should be conducted on the Twin Cities campus to determine whether faculty favor or oppose a change from a quarter to a semester system. The courtesy of a similar referendum has been extended to faculty members on the out state campuses as well.

I believe we should participate in this survey. It will provide us with a current, informed response to whatever action the Twin Cities Campus Assembly may take on the matter. The attached questionnaire is identical to that being used by the Twin Cities campus faculty with the exception of substituting "UMM" for "Twin Cities campus" and a modification of item 6 where UMM divisions have been substituted for Twin Cities campus colleges, schools, and programs.

The survey is being sent to all regular faculty members on the Morris campus. Since possible change to the semester system will affect the lives of all faculty, it is extremely important that you voice your opinion about the semester vs. quarter systems. The survey takes only a few minutes to complete. A nearly 100% return is essential for the response to be accurate. Please fill it out and do not fold it. Return it to Pat Tanner in the chancellor's office by Monday, March 31, 1986. If you have any questions about the survey, please call either myself (x6020) or Steve Granger (x6025). The results will be made known as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "John Q. Imholte".

John Q. Imholte
Chancellor

pt

Enc.

ACADEMIC CALENDAR QUESTIONNAIRE

This brief questionnaire asks you for your opinion concerning the proposed change from the quarter system to the semester system on the Morris campus of the University of Minnesota.

SECTION I: Opinions about the Quarter and Semester Systems

There are two basic related questions concerning the quarter system versus the semester system:

- the first question below asks you to indicate your opinion as to which of the two options is better, but does not ask you to address whether or not the University should change from the quarter to the semester system.
- the second question asks you if you think a change should be made from the quarter to the semester system on the Morris campus.

1. **Given your values, beliefs, and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better for the Morris campus? (Check one)**

- (1) Quarter system
- (2) Semester system
- (3) the two options are equal for me

Please comment: _____

2. **Now consider whether or not the Morris campus of the University of Minnesota should change its current three-quarter system, with fall quarter beginning in late September, to a semester system, with fall semester beginning immediately after Labor Day? (Check one)**

- (1) No, retain the current system with fall quarter beginning in late September and with spring quarter ending in mid-June. If "No," please go to Section II below.
- (2) Yes, change to the semester system with fall semester beginning very soon after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21. If "Yes," please go to Section III below.

SECTION II: Prefer to Retain the Current Quarter System

This section is for faculty who prefer to retain the current quarter system.

3. What is your major objection to changing to the semester system as described above?

SECTION III: Prefer Change to the Semester System

This section is for faculty who prefer to change to the semester system with fall term beginning immediately after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21.

4. Although there is no flexibility in the starting date for the fall semester, there are several options for the spring semester. Please indicate your preference from the options listed below:
- ___ (1) Early in and early out (e.g., begin spring semester in early January and end it in mid-May)
- ___ (2) Late in and late out (e.g., begin spring semester in late January and end it in mid-June)
- ___ (3) No preference as to starting and ending dates for spring semester
5. If the decision is made in the next few months to change to the semester system, when do you think it is feasible to make the change?

Fall semester 19___

SECTION IV: Faculty Characteristics

Your answers to this set of questions will help us understand the differences of opinion that exist concerning the quarter versus semester systems.

6. What is your division? (check one)

- (1) Education
 (2) Humanities
 (3) Science & Mathematics
 (4) Social Sciences
 (5) Other Unit (please specify): _____

7. Tenure status?

- (1) Tenure-track position (2) Tenured

8. Rank?

- (1) Instructor
 (2) Assistant Professor
 (3) Associate Professor
 (4) Professor
 (5) Other (please specify): _____

9. Gender?

- (1) Female (2) Male

10. How many years have you been a faculty member at the University of Minnesota, Morris?

____ years

11. What experiences have you had with the quarter and semester? For each of the following, indicate the academic calendar you experienced. (Circle all of the following that apply.)

	<u>Not Applicable</u>	<u>Quarter System</u>	<u>Semester System</u>	<u>Other System</u>
a. As an undergraduate	9	1	1	1
b. As a graduate school/ professional school student	9	1	1	1
c. As a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota	9	1	1	1

12. What professional development experiences have you had while on the faculty of the University of Minnesota, Morris? (Check all that apply.)

- (1) Single quarter leave
- (1) Sabbatical
- (1) Unpaid leave of absence
- (1) Released time on external grant

13. For the current year (i.e., Summer Session I, 1985, through Spring Quarter, 1986) how many courses did you teach in each of the following categories?

	<u>Number</u>
a. Total day-school courses across fall, winter, and spring quarters	_____
b. Total courses in Summer Sessions I & II	_____
c. Total credit courses offered through Continuing Education & Extension from SSI 1985 through Spring Quarter 1986	_____

14. How would you describe your current activities at the University? Please check the one category that best describes your role.

- (1) Primarily involved in teaching
- (2) Primarily involved in research
- (3) Equally involved in teaching and research
- (4) Discipline-related service
- (5) University service and administration

15. The following items describe activities and responsibilities that may relate to faculty preferences for the quarter versus the semester system. (Check all of the following that apply.)

- (1) Field work that takes me away from campus for a week or more during fall, winter, and/or spring quarters
- (1) Non-University consulting of approximately one day per week
- (1) Responsibility for the teaching of clinical courses
- (1) Clinical responsibilities to patients as clients served by the University

16. The Semester Working Group, chaired by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett, submitted its report in April, 1985, concerning changing to the semester system. Indicate your familiarity with their work by checking all of the following that apply.

- (1) Was aware of the report before now
- (1) Have seen the report
- (1) Have read the report.
- (1) Have talked about the report with colleagues

---Thank you for your time and cooperation---

PLEASE DO NOT FOLD. RETURN YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY BY MARCH 31 TO:

Pat Tanner
Office of the Chancellor
UMM

2/1/14

ACADEMIC CALENDAR QUESTIONNAIRE

This brief questionnaire asks you for your opinion concerning the proposed change from the quarter system to the semester system on the Morris campus of the University of Minnesota.

SECTION I: Opinions about the Quarter and Semester Systems

There are two basic related questions concerning the quarter system versus the semester system:

- the first question below asks you to indicate your opinion as to which of the two options is better, but does not ask you to address whether or not the University should change from the quarter to the semester system.
- the second question asks you if you think a change should be made from the quarter to the semester system on the Morris campus.

1. **Given your values, beliefs, and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better for the Morris campus? (Check one)**

- (1) Quarter system
- (2) Semester system
- (3) the two options are equal for me

Please comment: _____

2. **Now consider whether or not the Morris campus of the University of Minnesota should change its current three-quarter system, with fall quarter beginning in late September, to a semester system, with fall semester beginning immediately after Labor Day? (Check one)**

- (1) No, retain the current system with fall quarter beginning in late September and with spring quarter ending in mid-June. If "No," please go to Section II below.
- (2) Yes, change to the semester system with fall semester beginning very soon after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21. If "Yes," please go to Section III below.

SECTION II: Prefer to Retain the Current Quarter System

This section is for faculty who prefer to retain the current quarter system.

3. What is your major objection to changing to the semester system as described above?

SECTION III: Prefer Change to the Semester System

This section is for faculty who prefer to change to the semester system with fall term beginning immediately after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21.

4. Although there is no flexibility in the starting date for the fall semester, there are several options for the spring semester. Please indicate your preference from the options listed below:
- ___ (1) Early in and early out (e.g., begin spring semester in early January and end it in mid-May)
- ___ (2) Late in and late out (e.g., begin spring semester in late January and end it in mid-June)
- ___ (3) No preference as to starting and ending dates for spring semester
5. If the decision is made in the next few months to change to the semester system, when do you think it is feasible to make the change?

Fall semester 19___

SECTION IV: Faculty Characteristics

Your answers to this set of questions will help us understand the differences of opinion that exist concerning the quarter versus semester systems.

6. What is your division? (check one)

- (1) Education
- (2) Humanities
- (3) Science & Mathematics
- (4) Social Sciences
- (5) Other Unit (please specify): _____

7. Tenure status?

- (1) Tenure-track position (2) Tenured

8. Rank?

- (1) Instructor
- (2) Assistant Professor
- (3) Associate Professor
- (4) Professor
- (5) Other (please specify): _____

9. Gender?

- (1) Female (2) Male

10. How many years have you been a faculty member at the University of Minnesota, Morris?

years

11. What experiences have you had with the quarter and semester? For each of the following, indicate the academic calendar you experienced. (Circle all of the following that apply.)

	<u>Not Applicable</u>	<u>Quarter System</u>	<u>Semester System</u>	<u>Other System</u>
a. As an undergraduate	9	1	1	1
b. As a graduate school/ professional school student	9	1	1	1
c. As a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota	9	1	1	1

12. What professional development experiences have you had while on the faculty of the University of Minnesota, Morris? (Check all that apply.)

- (1) Single quarter leave
- (1) Sabbatical
- (1) Unpaid leave of absence
- (1) Released time on external grant

13. For the current year (i.e., Summer Session I, 1985, through Spring Quarter, 1986) how many courses did you teach in each of the following categories?

	<u>Number</u>
a. Total day-school courses across fall, winter, and spring quarters	_____
b. Total courses in Summer Sessions I & II	_____
c. Total credit courses offered through Continuing Education & Extension from SSI 1985 through Spring Quarter 1986	_____

14. How would you describe your current activities at the University? Please check the one category that best describes your role.

- (1) Primarily involved in teaching
- (2) Primarily involved in research
- (3) Equally involved in teaching and research
- (4) Discipline-related service
- (5) University service and administration

15. The following items describe activities and responsibilities that may relate to faculty preferences for the quarter versus the semester system. (Check all of the following that apply.)

- (1) Field work that takes me away from campus for a week or more during fall, winter, and/or spring quarters
- (1) Non-University consulting of approximately one day per week
- (1) Responsibility for the teaching of clinical courses
- (1) Clinical responsibilities to patients as clients served by the University

16. The Semester Working Group, chaired by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett, submitted its report in April, 1985, concerning changing to the semester system. Indicate your familiarity with their work by checking all of the following that apply.

- (1) Was aware of the report before now
- (1) Have seen the report
- (1) Have read the report.
- (1) Have talked about the report with colleagues

---Thank you for your time and cooperation---

PLEASE DO NOT FOLD. RETURN YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY BY MARCH 31 TO:

Pat Tanner
Office of the Chancellor
UMM

Duluth

SUMMARY REPORT OF
FACULTY VIEWS CONCERNING THE PROPOSAL
TO CHANGE TO THE SEMESTER SYSTEM
ON THE DULUTH CAMPUS

Darwin D. Hendel, Jeanne Solberg, and Susan Urahn

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Minnesota

May 2, 1986

One of the recommendations in the Final Report of the Task Force on the Student Experience (July 13, 1984) was as follows:

The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs should initiate studies to identify the most effective learning strategies for lower division students.

Among the several suggested actions associated with this recommendation was that the University should "consider implementing the semester system to facilitate more intensive study in particular course areas."

Subsequently, President Keller appointed the Semester Working Group, chaired by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett, to study the implications of changing to the semester system. Since the Semester Working Group submitted its report in April 1985, there have been discussions in the University Senate and elsewhere about the proposed change. Although the Senate made no formal recommendations about the proposed change, it did recommend that a formal survey of faculty opinion be undertaken prior to further actions on the proposed change. The study described in this report was conducted to respond to the Senate's recommendation for further information describing faculty opinions about the proposed change.

This report summarizes the results of distributing a survey on the Duluth campus. Other parallel reports summarize similar results for the University's other campuses that conducted faculty opinion studies on their campuses. The following six questions serve as the outline for discussing the survey process and its results:

- o How was the survey designed and who was surveyed?
- o Who responded to the Academic Calendar Questionnaire?
- o How familiar were faculty with the work of the Semester Working Group?
- o What were faculty preferences regarding the proposed change to the semester system?
- o What were the correlates of faculty opinions? and
- o What reasons did faculty state as the basis for their opinions?

How Was the Survey Designed and Who Was Surveyed?

The Academic Calendar Questionnaire was designed to achieve three purposes: a) to obtain faculty preferences for the quarter versus semester systems and related aspects of the proposed change to the semester system; b) to collect faculty descriptive data (e.g., teaching responsibilities, college of appointment, and sabbatical experiences) that might relate to their preferences; and c) to allow faculty to explain the basis for their preferences. These three purposes guided the development of a short

questionnaire with appropriate questions for each of the three purposes noted above.

A draft version of the questionnaire was prepared after an initial meeting with faculty members on the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA). SCFA reviewed the draft and suggested some modifications in content before a final version was prepared. At that time, a copy of the questionnaire was sent to the chancellors of each of the other four campuses to invite their campuses to participate in a parallel study if they wished to do so. Appendix A contains a copy of the survey used on the Duluth campus. Appendix B-1 contains an overview of the survey results for each of the campuses of the University.

Additional discussions in SCFA and the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs concerned the target population of potential faculty respondents. The decision was made that only regular faculty (i.e., tenured and tenure-track) should be surveyed since they would be most affected by a decision to change to the semester system. The survey was sent on February 28, 1986 to all 398 faculty on the Duluth campus. In the accompanying cover letter, signed by Chancellor Heller, faculty were asked to return their completed surveys to the Duluth Campus. When the data analysis began, 182 questionnaires had been forwarded to the Twin Cities campus, representing 45.7 percent of the faculty on the Duluth campus. The results described on the following pages are based on the 182 completed questionnaires received as of April 14, 1986.

Who Responded to the Academic Calendar Questionnaire?

Completed questionnaires were received from 182 faculty (45.7 percent of those who were sent surveys in February 1986). In addition to the primary preference questions on the Academic Calendar Questionnaire, it contained several questions to be used in determining correlates of faculty opinion. Of the faculty respondents, 29.7 percent were assistant professors, 34.1 percent were associate professors, and 30.2 percent were professors. Tables 1, 2, and 3 contain the descriptive statistics for each of the items used in the analysis of factors contributing to faculty members' opinions about the proposed change to the semester system. Since those items are important for this report only insofar as they relate to opinions about the proposed change to the semester system, they are not discussed here.

How Familiar Were Faculty with the Report of the Semester Working Group?

One set of questions on the survey asked faculty to indicate their familiarity with the report of the Semester Working Group. The results are as follows:

- o 52.7 percent of the faculty respondents were aware of the report;
- o 21.4 percent had seen the report;
- o 24.7 percent of the faculty had read the report; and

- o 20.3 percent had talked with colleagues about the report.

A subsequent section of this report addresses the relationship between responses to the above questions and opinions about the proposed change to the semester system.

What Were Faculty Preferences Regarding the Proposed Change?

Although previous surveys on the topic asked for opinions about numerous starting and beginning dates, the intent of this survey was to focus on the distinction between the quarter versus semester system with some constraints (e.g., that the fall semester begin after Labor Day and end before the holidays). Only two questions were included in the present study:

- o Given your values, beliefs, and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better for the Duluth campus? and
- o Should the Duluth campus of the University of Minnesota change its current three-quarter system to a semester system, with fall semester beginning immediately after Labor Day?

The frequencies and percentages in Table 4 indicate faculty members' responses to each of the above two questions. About two-fifths (37.9%) of the faculty prefer the quarter system, over one-half (51.1%) prefer the semester system, and another 9.9 percent said both options were equal. Another 2 faculty (1.1%) did not give a choice; many of these commented that they had no basis for choosing and/or had no instructional responsibilities. In the second question in which faculty were asked to indicate whether or not the change to the semester system should be made, 56.6 percent said "yes," 40.1 percent said "no," and another 3.3 percent did not respond.

In addition to the above questions, faculty who preferred to change to the semester system were asked to indicate their preferences for the spring semester starting and ending dates as well as a feasible target date for making the change. Table 5 indicates faculty members' responses concerning these scheduling issues if the proposed change to the semester system is made.

What Were the Correlates of Faculty Opinions?

As noted previously, the remaining questions on the survey were included to determine if faculty characteristics related to their preferences for the quarter versus the semester system. Some items (e.g., college) were included because of clear expectations that differences existed among collegiate units, whereas other items (e.g., gender and sabbatical experience) were included because of less obvious expectations.

The analysis related each of the faculty characteristics to the two criterion questions (i.e., preference for the quarter, preference for the semester, or no preference, and whether or not the Twin Cities campus should

change to the semester system) using either chi-square analyses for categorical variables (e.g., gender) or t-tests or analysis of variance for continuous variables (e.g., years at the University). The following summary indicates whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the characteristic and responses to the two questions, and if so, the nature of the difference.

- o College of appointment was significantly related to both the preference ($X^2 = 18.47$, $p > .05$). The results in Table 6 indicate the collegiate percentages in each response category.
- o The comparison between tenured and tenure-track faculty indicated that tenured faculty were more likely than tenure-track faculty to prefer either the quarter or semester systems ($X^2 = 7.28$, $p < .05$). For the preference question, 41.1 percent of the tenured faculty versus 30.6 percent of the tenure-track faculty preferred the quarter; 51.9 percent versus 47.2 percent, respectively, favored the semester system; and 7.0 percent of the tenured faculty versus 22.2 percent of the tenure-track faculty had no preference.
- o The results indicated no statistically significant differences in preference ($X^2 = 6.65$, $p > .05$) among the faculty ranks.
- o Among the five primary role groups, there was not a statistically significant differences in preference ($X^2 = 15.24$, $p > .05$).
- o The comparisons for years on the faculty at the University of Minnesota indicated no statistically significant difference in preference ($F = 1.76$, $p > .05$).
- o There was a statistically significant gender difference in the preference ($X^2 = 8.05$, $p < .05$) in response to the change question. A higher percentage of males than females (56.2% versus 39.5%) favored the semester and a higher percentage of females than males (21.1% versus 6.6%) had no preference.

What Reasons Did Faculty State as the Basis for Their Opinions?

Faculty were invited to comment on the nature of their preferences (e.g., quarter system, semester system, or no preference). Of the total group of 182 faculty responses, 113 (62.1%) commented about the basis for their preference. The analysis of the diverse and sometimes extensive comments focused on particular issues and concerns expressed, rather than on the most strongly and consistently expressed concerns of a particular faculty member. Hence, each of the several specific issues noted were tabulated for each faculty member since most of the comments were multidimensional in content. The frequencies and percentages in Tables 7, 8, and 9, respectively, describe the basis for preferring the quarter system, the semester system, or the two systems equally for the 113 faculty who commented about the basis for their preference.

TABLE 1

Descriptive Characteristics of Duluth Campus Faculty
Who Completed the Academic Calendar Questionnaire

QUESTION RESPONSE	N ^a	%
<u>Unit</u>	<u>182</u>	
College of Education and Human Services	30	16.6
College of Liberal Arts	43	23.8
College of Science and Engineering	47	26.0
School of Business and Economics	25	13.8
School of Fine Arts	14	7.7
School of Medicine	14	7.7
Library and Learning Resource Service	---	---
Natural Resources Research Institute	---	---
Supportive Services Program	2	1.1
Other	5	2.8
<u>Tenure Status</u>	<u>182</u>	
Tenure-track	36	19.8
Tenured	131	72.0
<u>Rank</u>	<u>182</u>	
Instructor	8	4.4
Assistant Professor	54	29.7
Associate Professor	62	34.1
Professor	55	30.2
Other	2	1.1
<u>Gender</u>	<u>182</u>	
Female	39	21.4
Male	138	75.8
<u>Years on University Faculty^b</u>	<u>182</u>	
6 years or less	50	28.2
7-15 years	63	35.6
16-20 years	36	20.3
21 years or more	29	15.8

^a Where the numbers do not sum to 182, the remainder represents missing data for that item.

^b The mean was 12.67 (SD = 8.06), with a median of 12.00 and a mode of 1 year.

TABLE 2

Prior Experiences with the Quarter and Semester Systems
for Duluth Campus Faculty
Who Completed the Academic Calendar Questionnaire

Prior Experience	Type of System ^a					
	Quarter System		Semester System		Other System	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
As an undergraduate	72	39.6	122	67.0	10	5.5
As a graduate school/professional school student	84	46.2	128	70.3	3	1.6
As a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota	52	28.6	95	52.2	7	3.8

^a Percentages sum to greater than 100 since faculty may have had prior experience with more than one type of system.

TABLE 3

**Current Instructional Responsibilities
and Professional Development Activities
of Duluth Campus Faculty
Who Completed the Academic Calendar Questionnaire**

QUESTION RESPONSE	N	%	x	Median
Current Role	<u>182^a</u>			
Primarily involved in teaching	71	39.0		
Primarily involved in research	6	3.3		
Equally involved in teaching and research	90	49.5		
Discipline-related service	1	.5		
University service and administration	10	5.5		
Courses Taught (1985-86)				
Day-school courses			5.91	5.76
Summer Sessions I and II			.91	.44
CEE			1.44	.46
Other Activities/Responsibilities				
Field work off campus	22	12.1		
Non-University consulting	18	9.9		
Teaching clinical courses	13	7.1		
Clinical responsibilities to patients	4	2.2		
Professional Development Experiences				
Single quarter leave	70	38.5		
Sabbatical	44	24.2		
Unpaid leave of absence	22	12.1		
Released time on external grant	36	19.8		

^a Where the numbers do not sum to 182, the remainder represents missing information.

TABLE 4

Duluth Campus Faculty Members' Opinions
about the Quarter and Semester Systems

QUESTION RESPONSE	N	%
Preference	<u>182</u>	
Quarter system	69	37.9
Semester system	93	51.1
Both options equal	18	9.9
No response	2	1.1
Change to Semester System	<u>182</u>	
Yes	103	56.6
No	73	40.1
No response	6	3.3

TABLE 5

Duluth Campus Faculty Members' Preferences
for Spring Semester Starting Date
and Implementation Date

QUESTION	N	%
Spring Semester Starting Date	<u>107</u>	
Early in and early out (e.g., begin in early January and end in mid-May)	81	75.7
Late in and late out (e.g., begin in late January and end in June)	19	17.8
No preference	7	6.5
Change Implementation Date	<u>99</u>	
1986	8	8.1
1987	39	39.4
1988	37	37.4
1989	9	9.1
1990	5	5.1
1991 or later	1	1.0

TABLE 6
 Comparisons among Units in Faculty Members'
 Preferences and Change Responses

Unit	Preference		
	<u>Quarter</u> %	<u>Semester</u> %	<u>Equal</u> %
College of Education and Human Service Professions	53.3	33.3	13.3
College of Liberal Arts	25.6	65.1	9.3
College of Science and Engineering	45.7	39.1	15.2
School of Business and Economics	41.7	58.3	----
School of Fine Arts	28.6	64.3	7.1
School of Medicine	28.6	57.1	14.3
Supportive Services Program	----	100.0	----
Other	20.0	80.0	----

TABLE 7
 Content Analysis of Faculty Members' Stated Reasons
 for Preferring the Quarter System^a

Category	Total Number of Comments	Percent of Total Comments
	<u>55</u>	
More courses possible and/or greater variety	8	14.5
Better curriculum options, more variety and diversity	7	12.7
More consistent with interest and attention span for students and faculty	6	10.9
Oppose split winter quarter	5	9.1
More flexibility for students	5	9.1
More options possible to give greater program flexibility	3	5.5
Time frame is good for my courses/programs	3	5.5
Better for students	2	3.6
System works find so why change	2	3.6
Learning is better	2	3.6
Prefer quarter but with calendar revisions	2	3.6
Other	2	3.6
Tried both and prefer quarters	1	1.8
Convenient spacing in terms of seasons and holidays	1	1.8
More efficient use of faculty time	1	1.8
More flexibility in teaching loads	1	1.8
Works better with other activities such as field work, sports program, theatre	1	1.8
Too much disruption in making the change	1	1.8
Do what's best for UMD--not Minneapolis	1	1.8
Nature of student body (part-time, working, commuter, older)	1	1.8

TABLE 8

Content Analysis of Faculty Members' Stated Reasons
for Preferring the Semester System^a

Category	Total Number of Comments	Percent of Total Comments
	<u>93</u>	
Less paper work (registration, grading, exams)	16	17.2
Greater depth possible	9	9.7
More time for students to do research, writing, and projects	7	7.5
Better pedagogically, better learning	7	7.5
Much prefer semester	6	6.5
More relaxed, less hurried, and less pressured	5	5.4
Against split winter quarter	5	5.4
Increased efficiency	4	4.3
More time to develop topics adequately	4	4.3
Less expensive	4	4.3
More time for reflection and integration	3	3.2
More in accord with other institutions	3	3.2
More continuity and less fragmentation	2	2.2
Better fits my courses or unit	2	2.2
Better chance to get to know students	2	2.2
More time for faculty research	2	2.2
Reduces "start-up" time	1	1.1
Might force needed curriculum changes	1	1.1
Be done earlier in spring for jobs, field work	1	1.1
Less sense of rushing through topics	1	1.1
Fewer interruptions for vacation	1	1.1

TABLE 9

Content Analysis of Faculty Members' Comments
Regarding Their Lack of Preference

Category	Total Number of Comments	Percent of Total Comments
	<u>15</u>	
Advantages and disadvantages to both	8	53.3
Against split winter quarter	3	20.0
My classes can be taught under either system	3	20.0
Just so Duluth and Twin Cities are same	1	6.7

APPENDIX A



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
DULUTH

Office of the Chancellor
515 Darland Administration Building
10 University Drive
Duluth, Minnesota 55812-2496

February 28, 1986

TO: UMD Faculty

FROM: Robert L. Heller, Chancellor

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly is surveying members of the faculty of that campus on the question of whether or not they would like to change to the semester system.

Coordinate campus faculty members have been extended the courtesy of a referendum since any change on the Twin Cities campus will impact upon the coordinate campuses.

I would like to recommend that you take the few minutes necessary to complete the questionnaire attached to this memo, and return it to my office by March 12, 1986. Information provided by the survey will be very helpful to the administration and the Campus Assembly should the Twin Cities campus decide to convert to a semester system.

We have modified the Academic Calendar Questionnaire to make it useable on our campus.

CC: *Deborah Stuthman*
Betty Ralvenett
Darwin Hendel
Jack Imharte
Ked Soderick
Don Sargeant

RLH:mh
Enclosure

ACADEMIC CALENDAR QUESTIONNAIRE

This brief questionnaire asks you for your opinion concerning the proposed change from the quarter system to the semester system on the Duluth campus of the University of Minnesota.

SECTION I: Opinions about the Quarter and Semester Systems

There are two basic related questions concerning the quarter system versus the semester system:

- the first question below asks you to indicate your opinion as to which of the two options is better, but does not ask you to address whether or not the University should change from the quarter to the semester system.
- the second question asks you if you think a change should be made from the quarter to the semester system on the Duluth campus.

1. Given your values, beliefs and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better for the Duluth campus? (Check one)

- ___ (1) Quarter system
- ___ (2) Semester system
- ___ (3) the two options are equal for me

Please comment: _____

2. Now consider whether or not the Duluth campus of the University of Minnesota should change its current three-quarter system to a semester system, with both beginning immediately after Labor Day? (Check one)

- ___ (1) No, retain the current system with fall quarter beginning in early September and with spring quarter ending in late May. If "No," please go to Section II below.
- ___ (2) Yes, change to the semester system with fall semester beginning very soon after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21. If "Yes", please go to Section III below.

SECTION II: Prefer to Retain the Current Quarter System

This section is for faculty who prefer to retain the current quarter system.

3. What is your major objection to changing to the semester system as described above?

SECTION III: Prefer Change to the Semester System

This section is for faculty who prefer to change to the semester system with fall term beginning immediately after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21.

4. Although there is no flexibility in the starting date for the fall semester, there are several options for the spring semester. Please indicate your preference from the options listed below:
- (1) Early in and early out (e.g., begin spring semester in early January and end it in mid-May)
 - (2) Late in and late out (e.g., begin spring semester in late January and end it in mid-June)
 - (3) No preference as to starting and ending dates for spring semester
5. If the decision is made in the next few months to change to the semester system, when do you think it is feasible to make the change?

Fall semester 19 _____

SECTION IV: Faculty Characteristics

Your answers to this set of questions will help us understand the differences of opinion that exist concerning the quarter versus semester systems.

6. College/unit in which you are appointed? (Check one)
- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1) College of Education and Human Service Professions | <input type="checkbox"/> (7) Library and Learning Resources Service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (2) College of Liberal Arts | <input type="checkbox"/> (8) Natural Resources Research Institute |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (3) College of Science and Engineering | <input type="checkbox"/> (9) Supportive Services Program |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (4) School of Business and Economics | <input type="checkbox"/> (10) Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (5) School of Fine Arts | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (6) School of Medicine | |
7. Tenure status?
- (1) Tenure-track position (2) Tenured
8. Rank?
- (1) Instructor
 - (2) Assistant Professor
 - (3) Associate Professor
 - (4) Professor
 - (5) Other, Please specify: _____

9. Gender?

___ (1) Female

___ (2) Male

10. How many years have you been a faculty member at the University of Minnesota, Duluth?

___ years

11. What experiences have you had with the quarter and semester? For each of the following, indicate the academic calendar you experienced. (Circle all of the following that apply.)

	<u>Not</u> <u>Applicable</u>	<u>Quarter</u> <u>System</u>	<u>Semester</u> <u>System</u>	<u>Other</u> <u>System</u>
a. As an undergraduate	9	1	1	1
b. As a graduate school/ professional school student	9	1	1	1
c. As a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota	9	1	1	1

12. What professional development experiences have you had while on the faculty of the University of Minnesota, Duluth? (Check all that apply.)

___ (1) Single quarter leave

___ (1) Sabbatical

___ (1) Unpaid leave of absence

___ (1) Released time on external grant

13. For the current year (i.e., Summer Session I 1985 through Spring Quarter 1986) how many courses did you teach in each of the following categories?

	<u>Number</u>
a. Total day-school courses across fall, winter and spring quarters	_____
b. Total courses in Summer Sessions I and II	_____
c. Total credit courses offered through Continuing Education and Extension from SSI 1985 through Spring Quarter 1986	_____

14. How would you describe your current activities at the University? Please check the one category that best describes your role.

___ (1) Primarily involved in teaching

___ (2) Primarily involved in research

___ (3) Equally involved in teaching and research

___ (4) Discipline-related service

___ (5) University service and administration

15. The following items describe activities and responsibilities that may relate to faculty preferences for the quarter versus the semester system. (Check all of the following that apply.)

- (1) Field work that takes me away from campus for a week or more during fall, winter and/or spring quarters
- (1) Non-University consulting of approximately one day per week
- (1) Responsibility for the teaching of clinical courses
- (1) Clinical responsibilities to patients as clients served by the University

16. The Semester Working Group, chaired by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett, submitted its report in April 1985 concerning changing to the semester system. Indicate your familiarity with their work by checking all of the following that apply.

- (1) Was aware of the report before now
- (1) Have seen the report
- (1) Have read the report
- (1) Have talked about the report with colleagues

— Thank you for your time and cooperation —

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY BY MARCH 12 TO:

Chancellor's Office
515 DAdB

APPENDIX TABLE B-1

Comparison among Twin Cities, Duluth, and Morris Faculty
on Primary Questions on the Academic Calendar Survey

QUESTION RESPONSE	Twin Cities ^a		Duluth ^b		Morris ^c	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
System preference	<u>1,727</u>		<u>182</u>		<u>60</u>	
Quarter	861	49.9	69	37.9	27	45.0
Semester	613	35.5	93	51.1	27	45.0
No preference	227	13.1	18	9.9	3	8.3
No response	26	1.5	2	1.1	1	1.7
Prefer change to semester	<u>1,727</u>		<u>182</u>		<u>60</u>	
Yes	676	39.1	103	56.6	31	51.7
No	931	53.9	73	40.1	28	46.7
No response	120	6.9	6	3.3	1	1.7

^a The survey was sent in February 1986 to the 2,722 regular faculty (tenured and tenure-track) on the Twin Cities campus asking for a response by March 12, 1986. A postcard reminder was sent a week later to the non-respondents asking them to respond by April 2. Because of the large number (about 100) of faculty who called to say they had not received the original survey, the return deadline was set at April 14, at which time 1,727 (63.5%) had been returned.

^b The survey and cover letter signed by Chancellor Heller were sent on February 28, 1986 to all faculty on the Duluth campus. A total of 182 questionnaires were forwarded for analysis, representing a response rate of 45.7 percent.

^c The survey and cover letter signed by Chancellor Imholte were sent to the 84 regular faculty on the Morris campus. Of those, 60 (71.4%) were returned.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
DULUTH

Office of the Chancellor
515 Darland Administration Building
10 University Drive
Duluth, Minnesota 55812-2496

February 28, 1986

TO: UMD Faculty

FROM: Robert L. Heller, Chancellor

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'R. Heller', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly is surveying members of the faculty of that campus on the question of whether or not they would like to change to the semester system.

Coordinate campus faculty members have been extended the courtesy of a referendum since any change on the Twin Cities campus will impact upon the coordinate campuses.

I would like to recommend that you take the few minutes necessary to complete the questionnaire attached to this memo, and return it to my office by March 12, 1986. Information provided by the survey will be very helpful to the administration and the Campus Assembly should the Twin Cities campus decide to convert to a semester system.

We have modified the Academic Calendar Questionnaire to make it useable on our campus.

A large area of faint, illegible handwritten notes or scribbles in the lower middle section of the page.

RLH:mh
Enclosure

ACADEMIC CALENDAR QUESTIONNAIRE

This brief questionnaire asks you for your opinion concerning the proposed change from the quarter system to the semester system on the Duluth campus of the University of Minnesota.

SECTION I: Opinions about the Quarter and Semester Systems

There are two basic related questions concerning the quarter system versus the semester system:

- the first question below asks you to indicate your opinion as to which of the two options is better, but does not ask you to address whether or not the University should change from the quarter to the semester system.
- the second question asks you if you think a change should be made from the quarter to the semester system on the Duluth campus.

1. Given your values, beliefs and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better for the Duluth campus? (Check one)

- (1) Quarter system
- (2) Semester system
- (3) the two options are equal for me

Please comment: _____

2. Now consider whether or not the Duluth campus of the University of Minnesota should change its current three-quarter system to a semester system, with both beginning immediately after Labor Day? (Check one)

- (1) No, retain the current system with fall quarter beginning in early September and with spring quarter ending in late May.
If "No," please go to Section II below.
- (2) Yes, change to the semester system with fall semester beginning very soon after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21.
If "Yes", please go to Section III below.

SECTION II: Prefer to Retain the Current Quarter System

This section is for faculty who prefer to retain the current quarter system.

3. What is your major objection to changing to the semester system as described above?

SECTION III: Prefer Change to the Semester System

This section is for faculty who prefer to change to the semester system with fall term beginning immediately after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21.

4. Although there is no flexibility in the starting date for the fall semester, there are several options for the spring semester. Please indicate your preference from the options listed below:

- (1) Early in and early out (e.g., begin spring semester in early January and end it in mid-May)
- (2) Late in and late out (e.g., begin spring semester in late January and end it in mid-June)
- (3) No preference as to starting and ending dates for spring semester

5. If the decision is made in the next few months to change to the semester system, when do you think it is feasible to make the change?

Fall semester 19 _____

SECTION IV: Faculty Characteristics

Your answers to this set of questions will help us understand the differences of opinion that exist concerning the quarter versus semester systems.

6. College/unit in which you are appointed? (Check one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1) College of Education and Human Service Professions | <input type="checkbox"/> (7) Library and Learning Resources Service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (2) College of Liberal Arts | <input type="checkbox"/> (8) Natural Resources Research Institute |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (3) College of Science and Engineering | <input type="checkbox"/> (9) Supportive Services Program |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (4) School of Business and Economics | <input type="checkbox"/> (10) Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (5) School of Fine Arts | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (6) School of Medicine | |

7. Tenure status?

- (1) Tenure-track position (2) Tenured

8. Rank?

- (1) Instructor
- (2) Assistant Professor
- (3) Associate Professor
- (4) Professor
- (5) Other, Please specify: _____

9. Gender?

___ (1) Female

___ (2) Male

10. How many years have you been a faculty member at the University of Minnesota, Duluth?

___ years

11. What experiences have you had with the quarter and semester? For each of the following, indicate the academic calendar you experienced. (Circle all of the following that apply.)

	<u>Not</u> <u>Applicable</u>	<u>Quarter</u> <u>System</u>	<u>Semester</u> <u>System</u>	<u>Other</u> <u>System</u>
a. As an undergraduate	9	1	1	1
b. As a graduate school/ professional school student	9	1	1	1
c. As a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota	9	1	1	1

12. What professional development experiences have you had while on the faculty of the University of Minnesota, Duluth? (Check all that apply.)

___ (1) Single quarter leave

___ (1) Sabbatical

___ (1) Unpaid leave of absence

___ (1) Released time on external grant

13. For the current year (i.e., Summer Session I 1985 through Spring Quarter 1986) how many courses did you teach in each of the following categories?

	<u>Number</u>
a. Total day-school courses across fall, winter and spring quarters	_____
b. Total courses in Summer Sessions I and II	_____
c. Total credit courses offered through Continuing Education and Extension from SSI 1985 through Spring Quarter 1986	_____

14. How would you describe your current activities at the University? Please check the one category that best describes your role.

___ (1) Primarily involved in teaching

___ (2) Primarily involved in research

___ (3) Equally involved in teaching and research

___ (4) Discipline-related service

___ (5) University service and administration

15. The following items describe activities and responsibilities that may relate to faculty preferences for the quarter versus the semester system. (Check all of the following that apply.)

- (1) Field work that takes me away from campus for a week or more during fall, winter and/or spring quarters
- (1) Non-University consulting of approximately one day per week
- (1) Responsibility for the teaching of clinical courses
- (1) Clinical responsibilities to patients as clients served by the University

16. The Semester Working Group, chaired by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett, submitted its report in April 1985 concerning changing to the semester system. Indicate your familiarity with their work by checking all of the following that apply.

- (1) Was aware of the report before now
- (1) Have seen the report
- (1) Have read the report
- (1) Have talked about the report with colleagues

— Thank you for your time and cooperation —

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY BY MARCH 12 TO:

Chancellor's Office
515 DAdB

from the

Chancellor's Office

Date

6-3-86

Deliver to

- For your information
- For your approval
- Your comments, please
- Review and file
- Review and return
- Please see me
- Please reply directly with copy to my office

Marilee Ward

Comment/Reply

Material as you requested - this is the
only report on the results that we have
on file.



University of Minnesota - Crookston

Crookston

PROJECT LIFESAVER

Project Lifesaver is a service project in Minnesota established by the St. Paul Press and Dispatch, Ruhr/Paragon Advertising and WCCO Radio and Television. This public service project is designed to change the attitudes and behavior of Minnesota drivers. The goals of the project are to:

- * convince motorists they are mortal and vulnerable to the dangers of driving,
- * persuade everyone to start the seat belt habit,
- * teach us what every citizen can do to prevent drunks from getting behind the wheel,
- * spread these messages so widely throughout the state that we can accomplish our ultimate goal—IN MINNESOTA NO ONE WILL DIE IN A MOTOR VEHICLE CRASH DURING THE 1986 MEMORIAL DAY WEEKEND.

Project Lifesaver has requested that each U of M employee make the pledge to save lives on Minnesota highways. Please see attached card for details. Thank you for your support.

—Lavine Hammerlee, Residential Life

SEMESTER VS. QUARTER

The outcome of the faculty vote regarding quarter versus semester system is as follows:

- 81% for quarter system
- 19% for semester system

There was a 72% return.

—Cleon Melsa

UMC INSIGHT

Dr. Donald Sargeant, chancellor, "A Year in Review"

- KROX - Sunday, May 25, at 9:35 a.m.
- KMCA-FM - Saturday, May 24, at 10:45 a.m.
- KQHT-FM - Sunday, May 25, at 6-7:30 a.m.

LAST PUBLICATION

This is the last issue of UMC Bulletin for the academic year. During the summer Bulletins will be mailed to your home address as needed. Have a fantastic summer!

—Barb Weiler, University Relations

UMC BULLETIN: Published by University Relations and Word Processing weekly September through May, monthly June, July, and August. Distributed to University of Minnesota - Crookston administration, faculty and staff. All articles and attachments submitted for publication must reach Word Processing by 4 p.m. Tuesday, phone extension 401 or 433.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TECHNICAL COLLEGE, CROOKSTON

Office of the Chancellor
Crookston, Minnesota 56716
(218) 281-6510 Ext. 343
Toll Free in Minnesota 1-800-232-6466

March 27, 1986

Dear Faculty,

About a year ago an ad hoc committee chaired by Dr. Betty Robinett completed a study of the relative merits of the semester and quarter systems. The Twin Cities Assembly has asked for a faculty survey of the Twin Cities campus to be complete by the end of March. The coordinate campuses have been given an opportunity to participate in the survey considering the proposed change to the semester system on the Twin Cities campus of the University of Minnesota.

Enclosed is a copy of the report of the "Semester Working Group". Dr. Robinett will be on campus on April 21 to make a formal presentation from the committee, as well as to answer any questions. At the completion of her visit, a survey will be mailed to you seeking your opinions on the merits of the quarter and semester systems.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cleon M. Melsa".

Cleon Melsa, Representative
Senate Consultative Committee

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Don Sargeant".

Don Sargeant, Chancellor

ACADEMIC CALENDAR QUESTIONNAIRE

This brief questionnaire asks you for your opinion concerning the proposed change from the quarter system to the semester system.

SECTION I: Opinions about the Quarter and Semester Systems

There are two basic related questions concerning the quarter system versus the semester system:

- the first question below asks you to indicate your opinion as to which of the two options is better, but does not ask you to address whether or not UMC should change from the quarter to the semester system.
- the second question asks you if you think a change should be made from the quarter to the semester system at UMC.

1. Given your values, beliefs and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better for the UMC campus? (Check one)

- (1) Quarter system
- (2) Semester system
- (3) the two options are equal for me

Please comment: _____

2. Now consider whether or not UMC should change its current three-quarter system. (Check one)

- (1) No, retain the current system with fall quarter beginning in early September and with spring quarter ending in mid-May. If "No", please go to Section II below.
- (2) Yes, change to the semester system with fall semester beginning very soon after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21. If "Yes", please go to Section III below.

SECTION II: Prefer to Retain the Current Quarter System

This section is for faculty who prefer to retain the current quarter system.

3. What is your major objection to changing to the semester system as described above?

SECTION III. Prefer Change to the Semester System

This section is for faculty who prefer to change to the semester system with fall term beginning immediately after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21.

4. Why do you prefer to change to the semester system? _____

5. If the decision is made in the next few months to change to the semester system, when do you think it is feasible to make the change? Fall semester 19_____

SECTION IV: Faculty Characteristics

Your answers to this set of questions will help us understand the differences of opinion that exist concerning the quarter versus semester systems.

6. Unit which describes your present activities (Check one)

____Ag

____Bus

____HHE

____Arts & Sciences

____Administrative

7. Tenure status?

____(1) Tenure-track position

____(2) Tenured

8. Rank?

____(1) Instructor

____(2) Assistant Professor

____(3) Associate Professor

____(4) Professor

____(5) Other, Please specify: _____

9. Gender?

____(1) Female

____(2) Male

10. How many years have you been a faculty member at the University of Minnesota?

____years

11. What experiences have you had with the quarter and semester? For each of the following, indicate the academic calendar you experienced. (Circle all of the following that apply.)

	<u>Not Applicable</u>	<u>Quarter System</u>	<u>Semester System</u>	<u>Other System</u>
a. As an undergraduate	9	1	1	1
b. As a graduate school/ professional school student	9	1	1	1
c. As a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota	9	1	1	1

12. What professional development experiences have you had while on the faculty of the University of Minnesota? (Check all that apply.)

- (1) Single quarter leave
- (1) Sabbatical
- (1) Unpaid leave of absence
- (1) Released time on external grant

13. For the current year (i.e., Summer Session I 1985 through Spring Quarter 1986) how many courses did you teach in each of the following categories?

	<u>Number</u>
a. Total day-school courses across fall, winter and spring quarters	_____
b. Total courses in Summer Sessions I & II	_____
c. Total credit courses offered through Continuing Education and Extension from SSI 1985 through Spring Quarter 1986	_____

14. The Semester Working Group, chaired by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett, submitted its report in April 1985 concerning changing to the semester system. Indicate your familiarity with their work by checking all of the following that apply.

- (1) Was aware of the report before now
- (1) Have seen the report
- (1) Have read the report
- (1) Have talked about the report with colleagues.

15. UMC operates within the University of Minnesota system and within higher education in Minnesota. What impact would the following have on your thoughts on the semester system for UMC?

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Unimportant</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
a. Twin Cities Campus moves to semester system	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Twin Cities Campus remains on quarter system	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Other state systems (state universities, community colleges, AVTIs) move to semester system	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Other state systems remain on quarter system	_____	_____	_____	_____

--- Thank you for your time and cooperation ---

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY BY _____ TO:

Cleon Melsa
Dowell Annex

university of minnesota

memo

To Marilee Ward

From Ed Frederick, UMW

- For your information
- For your approval
- Per your request
- For your attention
- Note and file
- Note and return
- Note and forward
- Please advise
- Please reply
- Send copy
- Please see me

I am attaching a copy of the summary of our survey on semester vs. quarter, per your request and for your information.

Date 4-29-86

Waseca

SURVEY SENT TO 51
RETURNED BY 31

** S U M M A R Y **

ACADEMIC CALENDAR QUESTIONNAIRE

This brief questionnaire asks you for your opinion concerning the proposed change from the quarter system to the semester system for the University of Minnesota.

SECTION I: Opinions about the Quarter and Semester Systems

There are two basic related questions concerning the quarter system versus the semester system:

- the first question below asks you to indicate your opinion as to which of the two options is better, but does not ask you to address whether or not the University should change from the quarter to the semester system.
- the second question asks you if you think a change should be made from the quarter to the semester system on the Waseca campus.

1. Given your values, beliefs and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better. (Check one)

- 22 (1) Quarter system
- 3 (2) Semester system
- 6 (3) the two options are equal for me

Please comment: SEE ATTACHMENT #1

2. Now consider whether or not the Waseca campus of the University of Minnesota should change its current four-quarter system to a semester system. (Check one)

- 27 (1) No, retain the current system.
If "No," please go to Section II below.
- 4 (2) Yes, change to the semester system.
If "Yes," please go to Section III below.

SECTION II: Prefer to Retain the Current Quarter System

This section is for faculty who prefer to retain the current quarter system for the Waseca campus.

3. What is your major objection to changing to the semester system?

SEE ATTACHMENT #2

SECTION III: Prefer Change to the Semester System

This section is for faculty who prefer to change to the semester system.

4. What is your major reason for changing to the semester system?
- a. Economic (savings in registration costs and time)
 - b. Retention (one less "decision date" to leave)
 - c. Ease of teaching - reduces faculty workload
 - d. Offers more teaching time (to develop subject matter)
 - e. Reduces the number of courses offered - could combine many of them

5. If the decision is made in the next few months to change to the semester system, when do you think it is feasible to make the change?

	1987 - 4	1989 - 3	1999 - 2
Fall semester 19 _____	1988 - 5	1990 - 3	No Answer - 14

SECTION IV: Faculty Characteristics

Your answers to this set of questions will help us understand the differences of opinion that exist concerning the quarter versus semester systems.

6. College/unit in which you are appointed? (Check one)

<u>5</u> (1) Agricultural Business	<u>2</u> (6) Home & Family Services
<u>2</u> (2) Agricultural Industries & Serv.	<u>1</u> (7) Horticultural Technology
<u>5</u> (3) Agricultural Production	<u>5</u> (8) Related Education
<u>4</u> (4) Animal Health Technology	<u> </u> (9) Academic Support & Library
<u> </u> (5) Food Industry & Technology	<u>4</u> (10) Student Affairs
	<u>3</u> (11) Other, please specify <u>Administration (3)</u>

7. Tenure status?

<u>9</u> (1) Tenure-track position	<u>21</u> (2) Tenured	<u>1</u> (3) Other
------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

8. Rank?

- (1) Instructor
- 16 (2) Assistant Professor
- 12 (3) Associate Professor
- 2 (4) Professor
- 1 (5) Other, Please specify: Ass't Educ. Specialist

9. Gender?

5 (1) Female

26 (2) Male

10. How many years have you been a faculty member at the University of Minnesota, Waseca?

	1 - 1	4 - 2	7 - 4	10 - 2	14 - 2	33 - 1
<u> </u> years	2 - 1	5 - 1	8 - 1	12 - 2	15 - 4	
	3 - 1	6 - 3	9 - 3	13 - 2	23 - 1	

11. What experiences have you had with the quarter and semester? For each of the following, indicate the academic calendar you experienced. (Circle all of the following that apply.)

	<u>Not</u> <u>Applicable</u>	<u>Quarter</u> <u>System</u>	<u>Semester</u> <u>System</u>	<u>Other</u> <u>System</u>
a. As an undergraduate	9	i (20)	i (13)	i (1)
b. As a graduate school/ professional school student	9	i (20)	i (14)	i
c. As a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota	9 (7)	i (13)	i (7)	i (2)

12. What professional development experiences have you had while on the faculty of the University of Minnesota, Waseca? (Check all that apply.)

<u>4</u> (1) Single quarter leave	Others - leave of absence - 1
<u>1</u> (1) Sabbatical	No Answer - 19
<u>3</u> (1) Unpaid leave of absence	
<u>3</u> (1) Released time on external grant	

13. For the current year (i.e., Summer 1985 - through Spring Quarter 1986) how many courses did you teach?

	<u>Number</u>	
a. Total number of courses across fall, winter and spring and summer quarters.	<u>1 - 1</u>	10 - 1
	4 - 4	11 - 1
	5 - 1	12 - 1
	6 - 3	14 - 2
	7 - 3	20 - 1
	9 - 4	21 - 1

14. How would you describe your current activities at the University? Please check the one category that best describes your role.

- 22 (1) Primarily involved in teaching
- (2) Primarily involved in research
- (3) Equally involved in teaching and research
- (4) Discipline-related service
- 9 (5) University service and administration

15. The following items describe activities and responsibilities that may relate to faculty preferences for the quarter versus the semester system. (Check all of the following that apply.)

1 (1) Field or laboratory work that takes me away from campus for a week or more during fall, winter, spring and/or summer quarters.

5 (1) Non-University consulting of approximately one day per week

13 (1) Responsibility for the teaching of laboratory courses.

19 (1) Need to stay in relation to agricultural or related industry seasons for items such as pre-occupational preparation program for our students.

No Answer - 3

16. The Semester Working Group, chaired by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett, submitted its report in April 1985 concerning changing to the semester system. Indicate your familiarity with their work by checking all of the following that apply.

20 (1) Was aware of the report before now

9 (1) Have seen the report

10 (1) Have read the report

9 (1) Have talked about the report with colleagues

5 - No Answer

COMMENT (1) - Did not know it existed in final form.

— Thank you for your time and cooperation —

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY BY April 11 TO:

Chancellor's Office

Response to question #1. Given your values, beliefs and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better? (22-quarter, 3-semester, 6-two options equal)

COMMENTS: THOSE PREFERING QUARTER SYSTEM

1. Reduced flexibility in semesters.
2. No advantage to switching.
3. Semester systems drag on, loses educational impact.
4. Semester systems limit variety of courses that can be taught.
5. Massive effort to restructure existing courses would be necessary.
6. Quarter system matches employment & work patterns.
7. Students wouldn't as easily be able to attend on a semester system.
8. If the Twin Cities campuses moves to semester then another situation exists.
9. Quarter system best suited to needs of students attending a technical college for agriculture.
10. Provides more alternatives for students in a two-year program.

COMMENTS: THOSE WHO BELIEVE THE TWO OPTIONS ARE EQUAL

1. If dollars for operation become a priority then the semester system would probably be better.
2. For this campus and focus the quarter system is better.
3. Both have pros and cons - depending on the course.
4. Experience on a four-year campus suggested semesters are better.
5. Semesters get pretty long but quarters cause one to hurry and are crowded. More courses can be offered on a quarter system but often not in sufficient depth.

Response to question #3. What is your major objection to changing to the semester system?

COMMENTS:

1. Not compatible with farming industry and seasons
2. Quarter system fits students needs better.
3. Quarter system fits our programs better.
4. Quarter system gives us flexibility.
5. Best fits UMW's mission (quarter system).
6. Programming of classes/courses.
7. May limit number of courses offered.
8. Harder to fit in labs.
9. Transferring may be a problem.
10. Semesters are physically and mentally exhausting for faculty and students.
11. Semesters are too long.
12. Quarter system is compatible to State University system.
13. POP programs fit better into quarter system.
14. Quarter system fits part-time, non-traditional student better.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TECHNICAL COLLEGE, WASECA

Office of the Chancellor
Waseca Minnesota 56093
(507) 835-1000

Waseca

March 31, 1986

To: UMW Faculty
From: E. C. Frederick, Chancellor
Re: Semester System Survey

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly is surveying members of the faculty of that campus on the question of whether or not they would like to change to the semester system.

Coordinate campus faculty members have been extended the courtesy of a referendum since any change on the Twin Cities campus will impact upon the coordinate campuses. This should not be interpreted as a recommendation by UMW administration to move from a quarter to a semester system, but rather an opportunity for you to make your feelings known about quarter vs. semester. The summary of your input will be forwarded to the project committee which we have in place on this matter.

I would like to recommend that you take the few minutes necessary to complete the questionnaire attached to this memo, and return it to my office by April 11, 1986. Information provided by the survey will be very helpful to the UMW administration and our Campus Assembly should the Twin Cities campus decide to convert to a semester system.

We have modified this Academic Calendar Questionnaire for the Twin Cities campus to make it useable on our campus.

Thank you.

:LR

ACADEMIC CALENDAR QUESTIONNAIRE

This brief questionnaire asks you for your opinion concerning the proposed change from the quarter system to the semester system for the University of Minnesota.

SECTION I: Opinions about the Quarter and Semester Systems

There are two basic related questions concerning the quarter system versus the semester system:

- the first question below asks you to indicate your opinion as to which of the two options is better, but does not ask you to address whether or not the University should change from the quarter to the semester system.
- the second question asks you if you think a change should be made from the quarter to the semester system on the Waseca campus.

1. Given your values, beliefs and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better. (Check one)

- (1) Quarter system
 (2) Semester system
 (3) the two options are equal for me

Please comment: _____

2. Now consider whether or not the Waseca campus of the University of Minnesota should change its current four-quarter system to a semester system.

(Check one)

- (1) No, retain the current system.
If "No," please go to Section II below.
- (2) Yes, change to the semester system.
If "Yes," please go to Section III below.

SECTION II: Prefer to Retain the Current Quarter System

This section is for faculty who prefer to retain the current quarter system for the Waseca campus.

3. What is your major objection to changing to the semester system?

SECTION III: Prefer Change to the Semester System

This section is for faculty who prefer to change to the semester system.

4. What is your major reason for changing to the semester system?

5. If the decision is made in the next few months to change to the semester system, when do you think it is feasible to make the change?

Fall semester 19 _____

SECTION IV: Faculty Characteristics

Your answers to this set of questions will help us understand the differences of opinion that exist concerning the quarter versus semester systems.

6. College/unit in which you are appointed? (Check one)

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| ___ (1) Agricultural Business | ___ (6) Home & Family Services |
| ___ (2) Agricultural Industries & Serv. | ___ (7) Horticultural Technology |
| ___ (3) Agricultural Production | ___ (8) Related Education |
| ___ (4) Animal Health Technology | ___ (9) Academic Support & Library |
| ___ (5) Food Industry & Technology | ___ (10) Student Affairs |
| | ___ (11) Other, please specify _____ |

7. Tenure status?

- ___ (1) Tenure-track position ___ (2) Tenured ___ (3) Other

8. Rank?

- ___ (1) Instructor
___ (2) Assistant Professor
___ (3) Associate Professor
___ (4) Professor
___ (5) Other, Please specify: _____

9. Gender?

___ (1) Female

___ (2) Male

10. How many years have you been a faculty member at the University of Minnesota, Waseca?

___ years

11. What experiences have you had with the quarter and semester? For each of the following, indicate the academic calendar you experienced. (Circle all of the following that apply.)

	<u>Not</u> <u>Applicable</u>	<u>Quarter</u> <u>System</u>	<u>Semester</u> <u>System</u>	<u>Other</u> <u>System</u>
a. As an undergraduate	9	1	1	1
b. As a graduate school/ professional school student	9	1	1	1
c. As a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota	9	1	1	1

12. What professional development experiences have you had while on the faculty of the University of Minnesota, Waseca? (Check all that apply.)

___ (1) Single quarter leave

___ (1) Sabbatical

___ (1) Unpaid leave of absence

___ (1) Released time on external grant

13. For the current year (i.e., Summer 1985 - through Spring Quarter 1986) how many courses did you teach?

Number

a. Total number of courses across fall, winter and spring and summer quarters.

14. How would you describe your current activities at the University? Please check the one category that best describes your role.

___ (1) Primarily involved in teaching

___ (2) Primarily involved in research

___ (3) Equally involved in teaching and research

___ (4) Discipline-related service

___ (5) University service and administration

15. The following items describe activities and responsibilities that may relate to faculty preferences for the quarter versus the semester system. (Check all of the following that apply.)

- (1) Field or laboratory work that takes me away from campus for a week or more during fall, winter, spring and/or summer quarters.
- (1) Non-University consulting of approximately one day per week
- (1) Responsibility for the teaching of laboratory courses.
- (1) *Reasons* Need to stay in relation to agricultural or related industry ~~sessions~~ for items such as pre-occupational preparation program for our students.

16. The Semester Working Group, chaired by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett, submitted its report in April 1985 concerning changing to the semester system. Indicate your familiarity with their work by checking all of the following that apply.

- (1) Was aware of the report before now
- (1) Have seen the report
- (1) Have read the report
- (1) Have talked about the report with colleagues

— Thank you for your time and cooperation —

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY BY April 11 TO:

Chancellor's Office

Poll to ask faculty's views of semester system

Twin Cities Campus Assembly to use survey in making recommendations to U administration

By Susan Klemond

University faculty members will be able to let the administration know what they think of a semester system this week when they receive questionnaires sent out by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs.

The results of the survey, commissioned last year by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly, should be compiled in time for the assembly to make its recommendation to the administration by the end of the school year, said Deon Stuthman, chairman of the University-Senate Consultative Committee.

The five-page survey asks faculty members whether they favor a quarter or semester system, and

whether they think a change should be made on the Twin Cities campus. It also asks them to list their reasons.

Under the calendar favored by the Semester Working Group, if a changeover is made, the school year would be divided into two 14-week semesters. The first would run from early September through mid-December. The second would begin in early January and finish in early May. In addition, a spring-summer term would run from early May through August. The Semester Working Group was set up by former University President C. Peter Magrath in 1984 to study the effects of a calendar change.

A poll of 331 students taken by the Minnesota Student Association last

year showed 63 percent favored retaining the quarter system. However, a majority of those polled preferred the early-in, early-out calendar common to semester plans, rather than the "late start" of most quarter systems.

Because the proposed switch to semesters would apply only to the Twin Cities campus, the questionnaire was sent only to the campus' 2,451 regular faculty members. The four coordinate campuses can participate if they wish, Stuthman said. The final decision will be made by the assembly—the members of the University Senate from the Twin Cities campus.

Stuthman did not know how much weight the faculty vote would carry. It depends on the nature of

the decision—the size and type of majority, and the arguments raised by the assembly, he said.

Betty Robinett, associate vice president for academic affairs and chairwoman of the Semester Working Group, said she is very much in favor of switching to semesters because it would allow faculty members to go into more depth in courses.

With a quarter system, "just when you get to your peak, you're finished," said Robinett, a linguistics professor.

Harry Hogenkamp, head of the Biochemistry Department of the Medical School, said he had not sensed a great desire for a change to semesters in his department.

Hogenkamp said the change would require a costly shuffling of faculty and courses, which he saw no great need for.

Stuthman favors a changeover if there is evidence showing students will benefit academically. If a semester system would result in a smoother registration process, there would be reason for the switch, he said.

David Ward, chairman of the sociology department, said members of the department generally favor a semester system, noting it would save faculty members time in book-keeping.

Requisition for Printing

TYPE 06

SUB-ACCT.

FUND

DEPT.

BUD.

REQ. NO.

723533

Instructions: Use this form to requisition printing, multilithing, addressographing, and photostating. Be sure to designate other than printing. *Submit copy on separate sheet.* Instructions other than those below should be placed on copy. Designate place of delivery.

NCR PAPER NO CARBON REQUIRED

Description of Job

IF THIS JOB HAS BEEN PRINTED BEFORE, PLEASE PUT LAST JOB OR REQUISITION NUMBER HERE.

Job Number _____

Requisition Number _____

Quantity

Date when job is needed?

Size

Number of Pages

Stock to be used

Cover stock to be used

Color of ink

Number from _____ to _____

Binding

Fold

Round corner

Perforate

Pads of

Punching

Proof to

For questions, call: _____

FOR USE IN BUDGET DEPT.	
Invoice No.	Amount

STARTED 8:00 AM
 FOR PRINTING IF YOU
 REASON TO CALL ABOUT
 PLEASE REFER TO THE
 NUMBER SHOWN ON THIS
 THANK YOU.
 YOUR JOB HAS BEEN
 FOR DELIVERY ON
 Ext.

FOR USE IN PRINTING DEPT.	
Requisition Received _____	
Job Ticket No. <u>2-19</u>	<u>34878</u>
Estimated Cost	<u>391.00</u>

DEPARTMENT

DELIVER TO
 Bldg. and Room
 or Address

SEND INVOICES TO
 Bldg. and Room
 or Address

REQUESTED
 Head of Dept.

Date

RECOMMENDED
 Dean or Admin. Officer

Date

BUDGET APPROVED

Date

APPROVALS



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Clerk of the Senate
424 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2125

February, 1986

Dear Colleague:

The Semester Working Group, which completed its work in April 1985, discussed the relative merits of the semester and quarter systems. The University Senate indicated that a faculty survey should be conducted prior to any decisions concerning the proposed change to a semester system on the Twin Cities campus of the University of Minnesota. The enclosed survey is in response to the Senate's request. The survey will provide an index of the faculty support, or lack thereof, for the proposed change to the semester system.

The brief survey is being sent to all regular faculty (i.e., tenured and tenure-track faculty) on the Twin Cities campus. Since the proposed change to the semester system will affect the lives of all regular faculty, it is extremely important that you voice your opinion about the semester versus quarter systems.

You will notice a code number on the survey. This is to tell us that we have received your completed survey so that we do not bother you with unnecessary reminders. Given the importance of the survey results, we will be persistent in asking you to respond. **The survey is short and takes only a few minutes to complete. Please fill it out and return it to Marilee Ward, Clerk of the University Senate, 424 Morrill Hall by Wednesday, March 12, 1986.**

If you have any questions about the survey, please call either Darwin Hendel or Jeanne Solberg at 373-5819.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Deon D. Stuthman".

Deon D. Stuthman, Chair

Senate Consultative Committee

:smd
Enclosure

ACADEMIC CALENDAR QUESTIONNAIRE

This brief questionnaire asks you for your opinion concerning the proposed change from the quarter system to the semester system on the Twin Cities campus of the University of Minnesota.

SECTION I: Opinions about the Quarter and Semester Systems

There are two basic related questions concerning the quarter system versus the semester system:

- the first question below asks you to indicate your opinion as to which of the two options is better, but does not ask you to address whether or not the University should change from the quarter to the semester system.
- the second question asks you if you think a change should be made from the quarter to the semester system on the Twin Cities campus.

1. **Given your values, beliefs and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better for the Twin Cities campus?** (Check one)

- (1) Quarter system
- (2) Semester system
- (3) the two options are equal for me

Please comment: _____

2. **Now consider whether or not the Twin Cities campus of the University of Minnesota should change its current three-quarter system, with fall quarter beginning in late September, to a semester system; with fall semester beginning immediately after Labor Day?** (Check one)

- (1) No, retain the current system with fall quarter beginning in late September and with spring quarter ending in mid-June
If "No", please go to Section II below.
- (2) Yes, change to the semester system with fall semester beginning very soon after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21.
If "Yes", please go to Section III below.

SECTION II: Prefer to Retain the Current Quarter System

This section is for faculty who prefer to retain the current quarter system.

3. **What is your major objection to changing to the semester system as described above?**

SECTION III: Prefer Change to the Semester System

This section is for faculty who prefer to change to the semester system with fall term beginning immediately after Labor Day and ending approximately December 21.

4. **Although there is no flexibility in the starting date for the fall semester, there are several options for the spring semester. Please indicate your preference from the options listed below:**

- (1) Early in and early out (e.g., begin spring semester in early January and end it in mid-May)
- (2) Late in and late out (e.g., begin spring semester in late January and end it in mid-June)
- (3) No preference as to starting and ending dates for spring semester

5. **If the decision is made in the next few months to change to the semester system, when do you think it is feasible to make the change?**

Fall semester 19 _____

SECTION IV: Faculty Characteristics

Your answers to this set of questions will help us understand the differences of opinion that exist concerning the quarter versus semester systems.

6. **College/unit in which you are appointed? (Check one)**

Academic Affairs

- (1) College of Biological Sciences
- (2) College of Education
- (3) College of Liberal Arts
- (4) Continuing Education and Extension
- (5) General College
- (6) Graduate School
- (7) Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
- (8) Institute of Technology
- (9) Law School
- (10) School of Management
- (11) University College

Health Sciences

- (17) Dentistry
- (18) Medical School
- (19) Mortuary Science
- (20) Nursing
- (21) Pharmacy
- (22) Public Health
- (23) College of Veterinary Medicine

Vice Presidents' Office

- (24) Vice President for Student Affairs
- (25) Vice President for Academic Affairs

Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics

- (12) Agriculture
- (13) Forestry
- (14) Home Economics
- (15) Agricultural Experiment Station
- (16) Minnesota Extension Service

Other

- (26) Please specify: _____

7. Tenure status?

___ (1) Tenure-track position ___ (2) Tenured

8. Rank?

- ___ (1) Instructor
- ___ (2) Assistant Professor
- ___ (3) Associate Professor
- ___ (4) Professor
- ___ (5) Other, Please specify: _____

9. Gender?

___ (1) Female ___ (2) Male

10. How many years have you been a faculty member at the University of Minnesota?

___ years

11. What experiences have you had with the quarter and semester? For each of the following, indicate the academic calendar you experienced. (Circle all of the following that apply.)

	<u>Not Applicable</u>	<u>Quarter System</u>	<u>Semester System</u>	<u>Other System</u>
a. As an undergraduate	9	1	1	1
b. As a graduate school/ professional school student	9	1	1	1
c. As a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota	9	1	1	1

12. What professional development experiences have you had while on the faculty of the University of Minnesota? (Check all that apply.)

- ___ (1) Single quarter leave
- ___ (1) Sabbatical
- ___ (1) Unpaid leave of absence
- ___ (1) Released time on external grant

13. For the current year (i.e., Summer Session I 1985 through Spring Quarter 1986) how many courses did you teach in each of the following categories?

	<u>Number</u>
a. Total day-school courses across fall, winter and spring quarters	_____
b. Total courses in Summer Sessions I and II	_____
c. Total credit courses offered through Continuing Education and Extension from SSI 1985 through Spring Quarter 1986	_____

14. How would you describe your current activities at the University? Please check the one category that best describes your role.

- (1) Primarily involved in teaching
- (2) Primarily involved in research
- (3) Equally involved in teaching and research
- (4) Discipline-related service
- (5) University service and administration

15. The following items describe activities and responsibilities that may relate to faculty preferences for the quarter versus the semester system. (Check all of the following that apply.)

- (1) Field work that takes me away from campus for a week or more during fall, winter and/or spring quarters
- (1) Non-University consulting of approximately one day per week
- (1) Responsibility for the teaching of clinical courses
- (1) Clinical responsibilities to patients as clients served by the University

16. The Semester Working Group, chaired by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett, submitted its report in April 1985 concerning changing to the semester system. Indicate your familiarity with their work by checking all of the following that apply.

- (1) Was aware of the report before now
- (1) Have seen the report
- (1) Have read the report
- (1) Have talked about the report with colleagues

--- Thank you for your time and cooperation ---

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY BY March 12 TO:

Marilee Ward, Clerk
University Senate
424 Morrill Hall

MEETING OF THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

Thursday, June 5, 1986

3:15 p.m.

25 Law Building

*Twin
Cities
Campus*

The voting membership of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly totals 179, including the President, 136 members of the faculty (including the Faculty Steering Committee), and 42 students (including the Student Steering Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (90) must be present. Advance notice is required for amendments to the constitution and 120 affirmative votes at one meeting or 90 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting. Advance notice is required for amendments to the bylaws and 90 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting.

Any member of the faculty and any student eligible to vote for members of the Assembly shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the Assembly. Only elected members or alternates, the Steering Committee and, in case of a tie, the Chair, shall be entitled to vote.

Representatives may designate any eligible alternates from their colleges, schools, and student constituencies as the alternates to serve in their places by written notice to the Clerk of the Assembly prior to the commencement of any meeting of the Assembly.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be available at each door of the meeting room, and members are asked to sign. A summary of attendance for the year will be included in the minutes of the last meeting of the year.

RULES

Rules will be available at the door.

I. MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17 MEETING

Action (2 minutes)

II. COMMITTEES OF THE ASSEMBLY, 1986-87

Action (3 minutes)

These nominations are in addition to those approved at the May 15 meeting.

CONVOCATIONS & THE ARTS Students: Lee Abbe, Julie Harrold, Matthew Wiley.

HONORS PROGRAMS Students: Judy Grew, Randal Svea, Debra Williams.

STUDENT AFFAIRS Students: Tim Brown, Elizabeth Greeman, Daniel Haley, Christopher Klein, Lesli Kravetz, Michael Martens, William Massey, Michael Ouyang, Thomas Patton, Jodie Parizek, Kristi Skjei, Sophie Ziegewald.

STUDENT BEHAVIOR Students: Lori Anton, Kate Graber, Kevin Hanson, Christopher Kein, Lesli Kravetz, Marshal Peterson, Michael Hazard Turnure, Allison Vanstone, Chuck Webber, Peter Zeller.

UNIVERSITY-ROTC RELATIONSHIPS Students: Jim Akeuc, Stephen Cook, 1 to be named.

INFORMATION:

STEERING Students: Patrick Durbin, Brenda Ellingboe, Roy St. Laurent, Andrew Seitel, Bruce Vandal.

III. STUDENT STEERING COMMITTEE

STUDENT GOVERNANCE AMENDMENT

Action (2 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus constitution, Article II.1, regarding Assembly membership be amended by adding: "The student body president shall, if not otherwise elected, serve as an ex officio non-voting member."

COMMENT:

At the April 17 Assembly meeting, the motion was approved 107 to 0; a second reading is required to fulfill the rule that at least 92 must approve the amendment at two successive meetings.

TIM PRATT
Chair

IV. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

LOWER DIVISION EDUCATION COORDINATION

Action (30 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Assembly adopt the following resolution regarding the coordination of lower division education on the Twin Cities campus:

In order to improve the quality of undergraduate education—especially lower-division education—on the Twin Cities campus, the following steps should be taken:

1. There should be established on the Twin Cities campus an Undergraduate Center, responsible to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, for the purposes of: a) providing a single office to serve as a point of first contact with the University for undergraduates and prospective undergraduates; b) serving as a visitor center in a highly visible and accessible location on the Minneapolis campus; c) helping people new to the Twin Cities campus—students and visitors alike—find their way to appropriate services and offices; d) providing advising referral and certain important advising services that are not currently provided; and e) simplifying the processes of approaching, entering, and moving through the University.

2. The Undergraduate Center and Student Support Services should be linked under Academic Affairs in such a way as to facilitate and encourage cooperative work in recruiting, prospective-student relations, admissions and records, financial aid, and other important student services. The Center should also be linked under Academic Affairs with the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs in such a way as to facilitate and encourage cooperative work and to ensure that the needs of students are adequately met. The possibility of a similar linkage of the Center and the Office for Students with Disabilities should be studied and seriously considered.

3. The faculty should seek to provide in all undergraduate classes, but especially in large classes, structured experiences that promote active learning and work to lessen the anonymity that students too often encounter. Such experiences are especially important during the freshman year when students new to the University feel most isolated. (Administrative actions of the kind listed in Recommendation 2a of the Special Committee's report should be taken to support and encourage faculty in these activities.)

4. Faculty and administrators should seriously consider establishing on the Twin Cities campus a research center on undergraduate education that would deal with all aspects of the educational process, including curriculum, teaching, learning, advising, and special programs. Such a center would draw on the expertise of the University's faculty, including specialists from the General College, the College of Education, and other colleges, to seek ways of improving the undergraduate experience.

5. Major administrative responsibility for protecting and enhancing the quality of undergraduate education should be focused on a senior officer in the Office of the Vice President

for Academic Affairs. That officer should be given sufficient authority to carry out his or her charge. In particular, the officer should: a) be responsible for the Undergraduate Center and for its linkage with Student Support Services and the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs; b) coordinate and support, in concert with their respective deans, the lower-division academic-support services offices in the several colleges in such a way as to encourage a higher quality of services, easier student access to services, greater efficiency, and protection of those offices' budgets in times of retrenchment; c) be responsible for carrying out the recommendations for improving undergraduate education contained in the report of the Committee on Quality Undergraduate Teaching and Learning (Page Report) and the report of the Task Force on the Student Experience (Wallace report); d) take steps to ensure that the All-University Liberal Education requirements are met by students in every college; e) take steps to ensure that barriers between colleges—both those that inhibit transferring from one college to another and those that inhibit students in one college from taking courses in another—are kept at a minimum; and f) initiate and support ongoing review of teaching and advising, curriculum overlap, and student involvement. The responsible administrative officer should report annually to the Assembly, through its Committee on Educational Policy, on the progress of activities in these areas and evaluations of their effectiveness.

The Special Committee's final report contains not only the recommendations listed above, but a number of others concerning curriculum, quality of teaching and learning, academic student services, creation of intellectual communities, and the role of the General College. In implementing this resolution the University should be guided by all the recommendations in the Special Committee's final report.

COMMENT:

The Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus believes that the University of Minnesota, being a large, urban, land-grant, research institution, needs to reaffirm in actions its commitment to quality lower-division education and, more generally, to quality undergraduate education on its Twin Cities campus. The members of the Special Committee believe that the size and complexity of the Twin Cities campus can be used to advantage in providing a rich variety of quality educational opportunities for undergraduates. They further recognize the value of an educational environment that emphasizes the importance of communication, computer, and study skills, fosters student engagement with a wide variety of subject matters, encourages student involvement in the academic life of the institution, honors the importance of student achievement through the educational process, and respects the diverse needs of students. SCEP unanimously endorsed the recommendations in the report.

W. ANDREW COLLINS
Acting Chair

V. STEERING COMMITTEE

CHILD CARE

Action (20 minutes)

MOTION:

The Assembly affirms its desire for the University to give more attention to child care needs and recommends:

—That central administration assign someone (possibly already within the current child care structure) to assume the responsibilities outlined for a child care coordinator in the April 1986 report, "Child Care at the Twin Cities Campus of the University of Minnesota," including documentation of needs for additional "slots";

—That the child care coordinator report at least annually to the Assembly Steering Committee;

—That the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs revisit the issue of cafeteria-style fringe benefits packages for faculty, with particular consideration for child care and reduced University tuition for faculty dependents;

—That the Senate Finance Committee strongly consider recommending for inclusion in the 1987-89 legislative request both capital expenditure items and operational subsidy items in the support of child care;

—That central administration explore the possibility of including child care cost when calculating student need for the purposes of financial aid.

COMMENT:

Responding to widespread preceptions that assistance in finding good child care was a matter of urgent concern to many University employees and students, President Keller and the Assembly Steering Committee in November 1985 charged a special committee to evaluate the University's involvement with child care over the previous 12 years, to determine the current need for child care services, and to recommend a policy and course of action for the Twin Cities campus. That committee, which was chaired by Professor Margery Durham, completed its work in April and submitted its report to the president and the Steering Committee. Discussions involving Professor Durham and other committee members, President Keller, and the Steering Committee produced agreement that initial steps should be taken immediately toward implementing some of the report's recommendations. Hiring or designating a University coordinator of child care is seen as essential, since that staff person will be asked to identify needs and match them with child care services available on and off campus, and to promote in numerous other ways development of non-competitive provision of care and services both on and off campus.

Copies of the report, "Child Care at the Twin Cities Campus of the University of Minnesota," are available from Cheryl Baldwin, 220 Morrill Hall (625-6300).

DEON STUTHMAN
Chair

VI. STEERING, EDUCATIONAL POLICY, FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEES

CALENDAR

Action (30 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Campus make no change from the quarter system academic calendar at this time.

COMMENTS:

The Steering Committee requested two committees, the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, to consider the advisability of a change in the academic calendar to a semester system, and to report their respective recommendations to the Campus Assembly. The Steering Committee asked the two committees to avail themselves of what it saw as the three most relevant sources of information: (1) the 1986 faculty survey, (2) the April 1985 report of the Semester Working Group, and (3) the 1985 Student Calendar Survey.

DEON STUTHMAN, Chr.
Steering Committee

The Assembly Committee on Educational Policy (ACEP) studied the question of changing to a semester system in 1984-85. Nothing we learned in that study—and nothing we have since learned—has convinced us that there are compelling educational reasons for such a change. In view of this, and of significant opposition to be proposed change among both faculty and students, ACEP recommends that the quarter system be retained.

WILLIAM HANSON, Chr.
Educational Policy Committee

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) conducted a survey of faculty regarding a possible change from the quarter to a semester system. The survey was conducted at five campuses and 2,042 faculty responded. This represented a 62% return rate. The results of the survey showed that the majority of faculty did not prefer to change to a semester system from the quarter system (54% vs. 40%). The percentage of faculty who preferred the quarter system was larger than that which preferred the semester system (49% vs. 37%). It was noted that in some colleges and units there was a wide range of percentage preference for one or the other system. In some cases a majority preferred the semester system and in others a very high percentage preferred the quarter system.

In view of the substantial number of faculty who preferred the quarter system and voted against a change to the semester system, SCFA recommends continuation of the quarter system. This recommendation is consistent with the results of the student survey conducted in 1985 and supports a similar recommendation by the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy.

WILLIAM BOYLAN, Chr.
Faculty Affairs Committee

SUMMARY REPORT OF FACULTY VIEWS CONCERNING THE PROPOSAL TO CHANGE TO THE SEMESTER SYSTEM ON THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS

(Coordinate campus data are included in the appendix)

One of the recommendations in the Final Report of the Task Force on the Student Experience (July 13, 1984) was as follows:

The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs should initiate studies to identify the most effective learning strategies for lower division students.

Among the several suggested actions associated with this recommendation was that the University should "consider implementing the semester system to facilitate more intensive study in particular course areas."

Subsequently, President Keller appointed the Semester Working Group, chaired by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett, to study the implications of changing to the semester system. Since the Semester Working Group submitted its report in April 1985, there have been discussions in the University Senate and elsewhere about the proposed change. Although the Senate made no formal recommendations about the proposed change, it did recommend that a formal survey of faculty opinion be undertaken prior to further actions on the proposed change. The study described in this report was conducted to respond to the Senate's recommendation for further information describing faculty opinions about the proposed change.

This report summarizes the results of distributing a survey on the Twin Cities campus. Other parallel reports summarize similar results for the University's other campuses that conducted faculty opinion studies on their campuses. The following seven questions serve as the outline for discussing the survey process and its results:

- How was the survey designed and who was surveyed?
- Who responded to the academic calendar questionnaire?
- How familiar were faculty members with the work of the Semester Working Group?
- What were faculty preferences regarding the proposed change to the semester system?
- What were the correlates of faculty opinions?
- What reasons did faculty members state as the basis for their opinions? and
- How do these survey results compare with results of previous surveys?

How Was the Survey Designed and Who Was Surveyed?

The academic calendar questionnaire was designed to achieve three purposes: a) to obtain faculty preferences for the quarter versus semester systems and related aspects of the proposed change to the semester system; b) to collect faculty descriptive data (e.g., teaching responsibilities, college of appointment, and sabbatical experiences) that might relate to their preferences; and c) to allow faculty to explain the basis for their preferences. These three purposes guided the development of a short questionnaire with appropriate questions for each of the three purposes noted above.

A draft version of the questionnaire was prepared after an initial meeting with faculty members on the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA). SCFA reviewed the draft and suggested some modifications in content before a final version was prepared. At that time, a copy of the questionnaire was sent to the chancellors of each of the other four campuses to invite their campuses to participate in a parallel study if they wished to do so. Similar studies have been conducted on all of them.

Additional discussions in SCFA and the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs concerned the target population of potential faculty respondents. The decision was made that only regular faculty (i.e., tenured and tenure-track) should be surveyed, since they would be most affected by a decision to change to the semester system. The survey was sent in February 1986 to the 2,722 regular faculty on the Twin Cities campus by using the campus addresses of faculty in the data base of the Academic Personnel System Office (APSO) in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. In the accompanying cover letter, signed by Deon D. Stuthman, chair of the Senate Consultative Committee, faculty members were asked to return their completed surveys by March 12, 1986, to the Clerk of the University Senate. A postcard reminder was sent during the third week of March to the faculty who had not yet responded asking them to respond by April 2, 1986. When the data analysis began, 1,727 questionnaires had been returned, representing 63.5 percent of the regular faculty on the Twin Cities campus. Another small number of returns were totally blank; in most of these cases a note was attached indicating that the faculty member was unavailable for comment. The results described on the following pages are based on the 1,727 completed questionnaires received as of April 14, 1986. (Since then, another 10 questionnaires were returned but have not been included in this analysis.)

Who Responded to the Academic Calendar Questionnaire?

Completed questionnaires were received from 1,727 faculty (63.5 percent of those who were sent surveys in February 1986). In addition to the primary preference questions on the academic calendar questionnaire, it contained several questions to be used in determining correlates of faculty opinion. Of the faculty respondents, 20.6 percent were assistant professors, 26.5 percent were associate professors, and 49.6 percent were professors. Tables 1, 2, and 3 contain the descriptive statistics for each of the items used in the analysis of factors contributing to faculty members' opinions about the proposed change to the semester system. Since those items are important for this report only insofar as they relate to opinions about the proposed change to the semester system, they are not discussed here.

How Familiar Were Faculty Members with the Report of the Semester Working Group?

One set of questions on the survey asked faculty members to indicate their familiarity with the report of the Semester Working Group. The results are as follows:

- 62.6 percent of the faculty respondents were aware of the report;
- 25.4 percent had seen the report;
- 22.6 percent of the faculty had read the report; and
- 31.6 percent had talked with colleagues about the report.

A subsequent section of this report addresses the relationship between responses to the above questions and opinions about the proposed change to the semester system.

What Were Faculty Preferences Regarding the Proposed Change?

Although previous surveys on the topic asked for opinions about numerous starting and beginning dates, the intent of this survey was to focus on the distinction between the quarter versus semester system with some constraints (e.g., that the fall semester begin after Labor Day and end before the holidays). Only two questions were included in the present study:

- Given your values, beliefs, and experiences concerning the semester and quarter systems, which do you think is better for the Twin Cities campus? and
- Should the Twin Cities campus of the University of Minnesota change its current three-quarter system to a semester system, with fall semester beginning immediately after Labor Day?

TABLE 1
Descriptive Characteristics of Twin Cities Campus Faculty
Who Completed the Academic Calendar Questionnaire

QUESTION	N ^a	%
UNIT	1,727	
Academic Affairs		
College of Biological Sciences	59	3.4
College of Education	109	6.3
College of Liberal Arts	322	18.6
Continuing Education and Extension	10	.6
General College	33	1.9
Graduate School	13	.8
Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs	7	.8
Institute of Technology	273	15.8
Law School	15	.9
School of Management	63	3.6
University College		
Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics		
Agriculture	157	9.1
Forestry	33	1.9
Home Economics	31	1.8
Agricultural Experiment Station	18	1.0
Minnesota Extension Service	29	1.7
Health Sciences		
Dentistry	55	3.2
Medical School	234	13.5
Mortuary Science	3	.2
Nursing	33	1.9
Pharmacy	21	1.2
Public Health	47	2.7
College of Veterinary Medicine	54	3.1
Vice President's Offices		
Student Affairs	14	.8
Academic Affairs	4	.2
Other	68	3.9
Tenure Status	1,727	
Tenure-track	367	21.3
Tenured	1,333	77.2
Rank	1,727	
Instructor	22	1.3
Assistant Professor	356	20.6
Associate Professor	457	26.5
Professor	856	49.6
Other	14	.8
Gender	1,727	
Female	335	19.4
Male	1,349	78.1
Years on University Faculty^b	1,727	
6 years or less	389	22.1
7-15 years	482	27.9
16-20 years	356	20.6
21 years or more	500	29.0

^aWhere the numbers do not sum to 1,727, the remainder represents missing data for that item.

^bThe mean was 15.01 (SD = 9.44), with a median of 14.96 and a mode of 15 years.

TABLE 2
Prior Experiences with the Quarter and Semester Systems
for Twin Cities Campus Faculty
Who Completed the Academic Calendar Questionnaire

	Type of System ^a					
	Quarter System		Semester System		Other System	
Prior Experience	N	%	N	%	N	%
As an undergraduate	629	36.4	1,121	64.9	53	3.1
As a graduate school/ professional school student	873	50.6	936	54.2	58	3.4
As a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota	442	25.6	709	41.1	58	3.4

^aPercentages sum to greater than 100 since faculty may have had prior experience with more than one type of system.

TABLE 3
Current Instructional Responsibilities
and Professional Development Activities
of Twin Cities Campus Faculty
Who Completed the Academic Calendar Questionnaire

QUESTION	N	%	X	Median
Current Role	1,727^a			
Primarily involved in teaching	265	15.3		
Primarily involved in research	240	13.9		
Equally involved in teaching and research	919	53.2		
Discipline-related service	96	5.6		
University service and administration	165	9.6		
Courses Taught (1985-86)				
Day-school courses			3.09	2.80
Summer Sessions I and II			.42	.16
CEE			.50	.12
Other Activities/Responsibilities				
Field work off campus	400	23.2		
Non-University consulting	244	14.1		
Teaching clinical courses	218	12.6		
Clinical responsibilities to patients	179	10.4		
Professional Development Experiences				
Single quarter leave	696	40.3		
Sabbatical	518	30.0		
Unpaid leave of absence	315	18.3		
Released time on external grant	272	15.8		

^aWhere the numbers do not sum to 1,727, the remainder represents missing information.

The frequencies and percentages in Table 4 indicate faculty members' responses to each of the above two questions. About half (49.9%) of the faculty prefer the quarter system, more than one-third (35.5%) prefer the semester system, and another 13.1 percent said both options were equal. Another 26 faculty (1.5%) did not give a choice; many of these commented that they had no basis for choosing and/or had no instructional responsibilities. In the second question in which faculty members were asked to indicate whether or not the change to the semester system should be made, 39.1 percent said "yes," 53.9 percent said "no," and another 6.9 percent did not respond. The appendix compares responses of the Twin Cities faculty to responses of the Duluth, Morris, Waseca, and Crookston faculties.

There was an obvious and clear relationship between the two questions in Table 4: Faculty members who prefer the quarter system do not want to change, and faculty members who favor the semester system support the proposed change. Of the 861 faculty members who preferred the quarter system, 93.4 percent (N = 804) said the quarter system should be retained, 3.6 percent (N = 31) favored changing to the semester system, and 3.0 percent (N = 26) did not answer the second question. Of the 613 faculty members who preferred the semester system, 92.7 percent (N = 568) wanted to change to the semester system, 5.5 percent (N = 34) indicated that no change should be made, and 1.8 percent (N = 11) did not answer the question. Of the 227 faculty members who had no preference, 33.5 percent (N = 76) favored changing to the semester system, 39.6 percent (N = 90) favored no change, and 26.9 percent (N = 61) did not answer the second question.

In addition to the above questions, faculty members who preferred to change to the semester system were asked to indicate their preferences for the spring semester starting and ending dates as well as a feasible target date for making the change. Some (N = 51 or 5.5 percent for the starting date and N = 61 or 6.4 percent for the target date) of the faculty (N = 931) who preferred not to change from the current quarter system responded to these questions as well, even though the instructions to the survey did not ask them to do so. Table 5 indicates faculty members' responses concerning these scheduling issues if the proposed change to the semester system is made.

TABLE 4
Twin Cities Campus Faculty Members' Opinions
about the Quarter and Semester Systems

QUESTION	N	%
Preference	1,727	
Quarter system	861	49.9
Semester system	613	35.5
Both options equal	227	13.1
No response	26	1.5
Change to Semester System	1,727	
Yes	676	39.1
No	931	53.9
No response	120	6.9

What Were the Correlates of Faculty Opinions?

As noted previously, the remaining questions on the survey were included to determine if faculty characteristics related to their preferences for the quarter versus the semester system. Some items (e.g., college) were included because of clear expectations that differences existed among collegiate units, whereas other items, (e.g., gender and sabbatical experience) were included because of less obvious expectations. Two separate statistical techniques (one univariate and one multivariate) were used to investigate the relationship between faculty characteristics and responses to the two primary questions.

The first analysis related each of the faculty characteristics to the two criterion questions (i.e., preference for the quarter, preference for the semester, or no preference, and whether or not the Twin Cities campus should change to the semester system) using either chi-square analyses for categorical variables (e.g., gender) or t-tests or analysis of variance for continuous variables (e.g., years at the University). The following summary indicates whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the characteristic and responses to the two questions and, if so, the nature of the difference.

- College of appointment was significantly related to both the preference ($X^2 = 286.75$, $p < .001$) and change ($X^2 = 124.45$, $p < .001$) questions. The results in Table 6 indicate the collegiate percentages in each response category for the two questions.
- The comparison between the tenured and tenure-track faculty indicated that the tenured faculty were more likely than the tenure-track faculty to prefer the quarter system ($X^2 = 26.61$, $p < .001$) and to prefer not to change ($X^2 = 5.05$, $p < .05$). For the preference question, 53.4 percent of the tenured faculty versus 40.4 percent of the tenure-track faculty preferred the quarter; 35.1 percent versus 39.4 percent, respectively, favored the semester system; and 11.5 percent of the tenured faculty versus 20.1 percent of the tenure-track faculty had no preference. For the change question, 59.5 percent of the tenured faculty and 52.5 percent of the tenure-track faculty wanted to retain the quarter system.
- Because of the small number of respondents in the instructor and other categories, only assistant, associate, and full professors were compared. The results indicated statistically significant differences for both the preference ($X^2 = 12.18$, $p < .05$) and the change ($X^2 = 7.10$, $p < .05$) questions. For the preference question, 44.3 percent of assistant professors, 49.2 percent of associate professors, and 54.4 percent of professors favored the quarter; 38.9 percent, 37.8 percent, and 33.8 percent, respectively, favored the semester system; and 16.8 percent, 13.0 percent, and 11.9 percent, respectively, had no preference. For the change question, 61.7 percent of the professors, 55.2 percent of the associate professors, and 54.9 percent of the assistant professors wanted to retain the current system.
- Among the five primary role groups, there was statistically significant differences for the preference ($X^2 = 44.26$, $p < .001$) and change ($X^2 = 12.06$, $p < .05$) questions. The percentages who checked quarter, semester, and no preference for each of the five categories were as follows: primarily teaching (60.2%, 30.7%, and 9.2%); primarily research (48.5%, 34.6%, and 16.9%); equally involved in teaching and research (51.6%, 36.8%, and 11.6%); discipline-related service (33.7%, 35.8%, and 30.5%); and University services and administration (45.5%, 41.8%, and 12.7%). The percentages who favored a change were for each of the five primary role groups as follows: primarily involved (35.1%), primarily involved in research (42.5%), equally involved in teaching and research (41.1%), discipline-related service (54.0%), and University service and administration (47.2%).
- The comparisons for years on the faculty at the University of Minnesota indicated statistically significant differences for both the preference ($F = 13.88$, $p < .001$) and the change ($t = 4.53$, $p < .001$) questions. The mean years on the faculty for the three preference groups were as follows: prefer quarter ($x = 16.21$ years), prefer semester ($x = 13.60$ years), and the two options are equal ($x = 14.43$ years). For the change question, those faculty members who favored a change had been at the University fewer years than those who wanted to retain the current quarter system ($x = 13.71$ versus $x = 15.89$ years).
- There were no gender differences in the preference question, but statistically significant gender differences ($X^2 = 4.29$, $p < .05$) in response to the change question. A higher percentage of females than males (47.6% versus 40.9%) favored changing to the semester system.
- The number of courses taught during the current year (i.e., total day school across fall, winter, and spring, total courses in Summer Session, and total credit courses in CEE) were analyzed in two ways. First, preference and change groups were compared on mean courses taught. Second, faculty members who had teaching responsibilities (i.e., one or more courses) were compared with those who did not indicate they taught. In the first analysis, there was a statistically significant difference ($F = 9.99$, $p < .001$) for only the preference question for the total number of day-school courses across fall, winter, and spring quarters. The mean number of courses taught for each of the three preference groups were as follows: prefer quarter ($x = 3.30$ courses), prefer semester ($x = 3.14$ courses), and two options are equal ($x = 2.37$ courses). In the second analysis, there were statistically significant relationships for all three measures of number of courses taught for the preference question and for total number of day-school courses for the change question. For the preference question, those faculty members who did not teach any day school courses were more likely than those who taught to indicate no preference (e.g., 24.2% versus 10.5%). A higher percentage of faculty members who taught one or more day-school courses than those who did not teach during the past three quarters indicated that no change should be made (60.6% versus 47.7%).

- For the set of four professional development experiences (i.e., single quarter leave, sabbatical, unpaid leave of absence, and released time on external grant), the data indicated differences in preference for faculty members who had taken a single quarter leave ($X^2 = 20.61$, $p < .001$) and for faculty members who had released time on an external grant ($X^2 = 11.43$, $p < .01$) and in change response for faculty members who had an unpaid leave of absence ($X^2 = 4.04$, $p < .05$). Higher percentages of those who favored the quarter or the semester system than those who had no preference had received a single quarter leave (40.5% and 45.5% versus 28.2%) and/or released time on grant (16.4% and 17.8% versus 8.4%). A higher percentage of those who favored changing to the semester system had taken an unpaid leave of absence than those who did not favor changing (20.7% versus 16.6%).

- For the four items that described faculty members' involvement in atypical instruction and service activities (e.g., clinical responsibilities to patients), there were statistically significant differences for clinical responsibilities to patients ($X^2 = 48.63$, $p < .001$), for field work away from campus ($X^2 = 15.22$, $p < .001$) and for responsibility for teaching clinical courses ($X^2 = 24.21$, $p < .001$) for the preference question and for the field-work away from campus ($X^2 = 11.54$, $p < .001$) for the change question. Lower percentages of those who favored either the quarter or semester system versus no preference had patient responsibilities (8.6% and 7.8% versus 23.3%) but higher percentages had field work away from campus (27.2% and 20.2% versus 17.2%). A higher percentage of those with no preference had responsibilities for teaching clinical courses (22.0% versus 12.7% and 9.3%). For the change question, a higher percentage of those who did not want to change (26.6% versus 19.2%) had field work off campus.

- The strongest and most consistent relationship between faculty characteristics and system preference and desire to change was found for the series of items that asked faculty members to indicate their prior experience with the quarter and semester systems as an undergraduate, as a graduate/professional school student, and as a faculty member at an institution other than Minnesota. Those results, summarized in Table 7, suggest that prior experience is, for all three prior types of experience, strongly correlated with both preference and change responses. Those with a particular prior system experience are more likely to express a preference for that system.

- Finally, responses to the two criterion questions were related to familiarity with the work of the Semester Working Group. For the preference question, higher percentages of those favored the quarter or the semester system versus those who had no preference were aware of the report (64.3% and 64.8% versus 54.2%, $X^2 = 9.05$, $p < .01$), had seen the report (29.6% and 22.8% versus 18.1%, $X^2 = 16.51$, $p < .001$), had read the report (26.4% and 19.9% versus 16.3%, $X^2 = 14.63$, $p < .001$), and had talked about the report with colleagues (39.0%, 27.1%, and 18.1%, $X^2 = 46.67$, $p < .001$). For the change question, higher percentages of those who did not favor a change than those who wanted to change, had seen the report (28.4% versus 22.5%, $X^2 = 6.73$, $p < .01$), had read the report (25.4% versus 19.1%, $X^2 = 9.55$, $p < .01$), and had talked with colleagues about the report (37.6% versus 25.3%, $X^2 = 26.48$, $p < .001$).

The second analysis was multivariate in nature: It analyzed how the set of faculty characteristics related to preferences by using a technique called linear discriminant function. In this technique, the criterion is group membership (i.e., prefer to retain quarter system versus prefer to change to the semester system). The first linear discriminant function used faculty demographic characteristics and the second used actual faculty experiences. The use of demographic characteristics correctly categorized 63 percent of the faculty into change versus no change groups, a 13 percent increase over the 50 percent chance level. The use of experiences correctly classified 61 percent of the faculty, an 11 percent increase. These analyses suggest that although univariate analyses indicated statistically significant correlations with preference and change responses, the faculty characteristics and experiences items did not explain much of the difference between faculty members who preferred to change versus those who preferred to retain the quarter system.

The analysis of the diverse and sometimes extensive comments focused on particular issues and concerns expressed, rather than on the most strongly and consistently expressed concerns of a particular faculty member. Hence, each of the several specific issues noted were tabulated for each faculty member, since most of the comments were multidimensional in content. The frequencies and percentages in Tables 8, 9, and 10, respectively, describe the basis for preferring the quarter system, the semester system, or the two systems equally for the 855 faculty members who commented about the basis for their preference.

How Do These Survey Results Compare with Results of Previous Studies?

Periodically in the last several decades discussions have arisen about the University's calendar and, in particular, the advantages and disadvantages of the quarter versus the semester system. The above results describe the current opinions of the regular faculty concerning the semester versus the quarter systems. The following paragraphs briefly summarize the results of earlier discussions and studies on the same topic:

- In 1920 the Senate Committee on Education sent a questionnaire in regard to the semester system to 79 department heads. Of those 49 who responded, 27 (55.1%) favored continuing on the quarter basis, 20 (40.8%) favored the semester system, and 2 (4.1%) were neutral.
- In May 1947, the President placed before the Committee on Business and Rules a proposal that the University schedule its academic year in semesters, rather than quarters. A brief, prepared by Dean Buchta, covering factors favorable to either system was circulated to the Committee for study.
- In November 1953, a report for the All-University Schedule Committee on the semestral versus the quarterly system of term scheduling was submitted. It recommended that the quarterly system be retained but that related changes in the calendar be made.
- In March 1959, the Administrative Committee again asked whether consideration should be given to the possible advantages of a semestral calendar. The President explicitly requested that the deans take leadership to implement recommendations made five years earlier to make changes in scheduling with the current quarter system.
- In May 1962, a report on the Committee on Institutional Research included a review of trimester programs prepared by the Bureau of Institutional Research. That review focused on recent calendar changes made at other institutions and included advantages and disadvantages of each calendar system. That report concluded with the statement, "The wide variety of changes adopted or proposed for accomplishing this end, however, suggests that objectives more specific than those of increased efficiency must be considered in any evaluation of the feasibility of various alternatives."
- In the spring of 1978, 587 students and 48 percent full-time faculty members on the Twin Cities campus were surveyed by Student Life Studies and Planning about the effects of the University's calendar. Responders were received from 437 (74%) of the students and 397 (80%) of the faculty who were surveyed. Both groups were asked to rank order their preferences for five calendar systems. The percentages of students and faculty members who ranked first each of the options were as follows:

	Students	Faculty
Current quarter system	27.1%	40.8%
Early start quarter system	44.2%	22.8%
Traditional semester	10.2%	17.3%
Early semester	12.1%	12.5%
4-1-4 semester	6.4%	3.2%

As the above results indicate, 63.6 percent of the faculty ranked one form of the quarter system first, whereas 33.0 percent ranked one form of the semester system first. The clearest difference between students and faculty members was in terms of the current quarter system versus the early-start quarter system.

- Two related studies were conducted by the Calendar Committee in December of 1981 and February of 1982. Both surveys were sent to all deans, directors, and department heads on the Twin Cities campus. The first survey made no mention of a change to semesters but sought opinions only on an early-start quarter system. Responses from about 100 individuals indicated considerable sentiment for an early start, but that any attempt to start early while retaining the quarter system would be broadly opposed. The Calendar Committee conducted the second survey to seek reaction to an early-start semester plan. Responses from 125 individuals indicated that University administrators were split about equally between those favoring semesters and those favoring quarters: 40.8 percent favored the quarter system, 38.4 percent favored the semester system, and 20.8 were equivocal.

● In May 1985, the Student Concerns Committee of the Minnesota Student Association Forum conducted a survey of the Twin Cities student body (N = 358 of a sample of 500 students enrolled winter quarter) and found a very strong preference for the quarter system and an early start-early finish calendar. In response to the question "Under which system would you best be able to reach your educational goals?" 49.4 percent checked quarter system, 22.0 percent the semester system, and 28.5 percent did not know.

TABLE 5
Twin Cities Campus Faculty Members' Preferences
for Spring Semester Starting Date
and Implementation Date

Question	Prefer to Change to Semester		Prefer to Retain Quarter ^a	
	N	%	N	%
	Spring Semester Starting Date			
Early in and early out (e.g., begin in early January and end in mid-May)	470	69.5	31	60.8
Late in and late out (e.g., begin in late January and end in June)	116	17.2	12	23.5
No preference	66	9.8	8	15.7
Change Implementation Date				
1986	39	5.8	3	4.9
1987	285	42.2	20	32.8
1988	207	30.6	22	36.1
1989	44	6.5	6	9.8
1990	7	1.0	5	8.2
1991 or later	2	.2	5	8.2

^aWhere the numbers do not sum to 676, the remainder represents faculty who did not answer the question.

^bAlthough faculty who preferred to retain the quarter system were not instructed to respond to this question, 51 and 61 did respond.

TABLE 6
Comparisons Among Units in Faculty Members'
Preferences and Change Responses

Unit	Preference			Change	
	Quarter	Semester	Equal	No	Yes
	%	%	%	%	%
Academic Affairs					
Biological Sciences	78.0	16.9	5.1	79.7	20.3
Education	59.3	32.4	8.3	64.8	35.2
Liberal Arts	38.6	54.8	6.5	42.2	57.8
Continuing Education & Extension					
General College	60.6	36.4	3.0	63.6	36.4
Graduate School	61.5	38.5	—	58.3	41.7
Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs					
Technology	45.0	41.3	13.8	56.1	43.9
Law	7.1	78.6	14.3	8.3	91.7
Management	68.3	30.2	1.6	73.8	26.2
University College					
Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics					
Agriculture	67.5	25.5	7.0	70.3	29.7
Forestry	81.8	12.1	6.1	87.9	12.1
Home Economics	61.3	32.3	6.5	67.9	32.1
Agricultural Experiment Station					
Minnesota Extension Service	33.3	44.4	22.2	33.3	66.7
Health Sciences					
Dentistry	51.9	32.7	15.4	57.7	42.3
Medical School	36.5	29.1	34.3	48.2	51.8
Mortuary Science	100.0	—	—	100.0	—
Nursing	33.3	57.6	9.1	48.4	51.6
Pharmacy	57.1	42.9	—	66.7	33.3
Public Health	70.2	17.0	12.8	80.0	20.0
Veterinary Medicine	74.1	13.0	13.0	78.8	21.2
Vice President's Office					
Student Affairs	50.0	42.9	7.1	57.1	42.9
Academic Affairs	25.0	75.0	—	25.0	75.0
Other	46.3	28.4	25.4	58.9	41.1

TABLE 7
Percentages of Faculty with Prior Experiences
with Semester and Quarter Systems:
Their Preferences and Change Responses

Type System	Preference			Change		
	Quarter	Semester	Equal	No	Yes	X ² (1)
	%	%	%	%	%	
As an undergraduate						
Quarter	66.1	24.7	14.3	57.13***	68.0	37.34***
Semester	46.9	41.3	11.8	39.16***	54.4	16.06***
As a graduate school student						
Quarter	59.3	27.9	12.8	59.03***	65.9	43.20***
Semester	43.8	44.6	11.6	65.63***	52.2	26.20***
As a faculty member						
Quarter	57.9	28.9	13.2	14.43***	66.1	14.77***
Semester	45.8	44.5	9.6	41.98***	51.4	29.63***

***p < .001.

What Reasons Did Faculty State as the Basis for Their Opinions

Faculty members were invited to comment on the nature of their preferences (e.g., quarter system, semester system, or no preference). Of the total group of 1,727 faculty responses, 856 (49.6%) commented about the basis for their preference. Not surprisingly, there were differences in the frequency of comments that related to preferences: 47.7 percent (N = 411) of those who favored the quarter system commented, 55.5 percent (N = 445) who favored the semester system commented, and 41.9 percent (N = 95) who had no preference commented.

TABLE 8
Content Analysis of Faculty Members' Stated Reasons
for Preferring the Quarter System^a

Category	Total Number of Comments	Percent of Total Comments
644		
More courses possible and/or greater variety	49	7.6
Better curriculum options, more variety and diversity	48	7.5
Flexibility for faculty scholarly and research time	46	7.1
More flexibility for students	45	7.0
Nature of student body (part-time, working, commuter, older)	39	6.1
More options possible to give greater program flexibility	38	5.9
Time frame is good for my courses/programs	33	5.1
More consistent with interest and attention span for students and faculty	33	5.1
Enables single quarter leaves and leaves of absence	20	3.1
Something to be said for both systems but change not worth it	20	3.1
Tried both and prefer quarters	19	3.0
Convenient spacing in terms of seasons and holidays	17	2.6
Better for students	16	2.5
No evidence that semester is better educationally	13	2.0
System works fine so why change	13	2.0
More efficient use of faculty time	13	2.0
More flexibility in teaching loads	13	2.0
Better for graduate students	13	2.0
Too much trouble to revise curriculum	12	1.9
Works better with other activities such as field work, sports program, theatre	11	1.7
Too much disruption in making the change	9	1.4
Students exposed to varied instructors	9	1.4
Other	115	17.9

^aThese 644 comments came from 411 faculty, 47.7 percent of those who favored the quarter system commented.

TABLE 9
Content Analysis of Faculty Members' Stated Reasons
for Preferring the Semester System^a

Category	Total Number of Comments	Percent of Total Comments
634		
Greater depth possible	63	9.9
Less paper work (registration, grading, exams)	52	8.2
Quarter too short to teach classes effectively	52	8.2
More time for students to do research, writing, and projects	51	8.0
Better pedagogically, better learning	33	5.2
More time to develop topics adequately	29	4.6
More suited to graduate student and advanced courses	28	4.4
More relaxed, less hurried, and less pressured	24	3.8
Increased efficiency	23	3.8
More time to assimilate ideas and concepts	16	2.5
Reduces "start-up" time	15	2.4
More continuity and less fragmentation	14	2.2
More time for reflection and integration	13	2.1
Less expensive	13	2.1
Better fits my courses or unit	11	1.7
More in accord with other institutions	11	1.7
Better chance to get to know students	11	1.7
Preference is very slight	11	1.7
Might force needed curriculum changes	10	1.6
Be done earlier in spring for jobs, field work	10	1.6
Much prefer semester	9	1.4
Less sense of rushing through topics	9	1.4
Other	134	21.1

^aThese 634 comments came from 445 faculty, 55.5 percent of those who favored the semester system.

TABLE 10
Content Analysis of Faculty Members' Comments
Regarding Their Lack of Preference^a

Category	Total Number of Comments	Percent of Total Comments
110		
Advantages and disadvantages to both	41	37.3
Academic year doesn't affect my work	23	20.9
Not sure	5	4.6
No experience with semester	5	4.6
Change would create too much disruption	4	3.6
Concerns about calendar with semester	3	2.7
Better to stay with quarter since we already have it	3	2.7
Other	26	23.6

^aThese 100 comments came from 95 faculty, 41.9 percent of those who had no preference.

APPENDIX
Comparison among Twin Cities, Duluth, and Morris Faculty
on Primary Questions on the Academic Calendar Survey

QUESTION RESPONSE	Twin Cities ^a		Duluth ^b		Morris ^c		Waseca ^d		Crookston ^e	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
System preference	1,727		182		60		31		42	
Quarter	861	49.9	69	37.9	23	38.3	22	71.0	34	81.0
Semester	613	35.5	93	51.1	30	50.0	3	9.7	8	19.0
No preference	227	13.1	18	9.9	6	10.0	6	19.3	—	—
No response	26	1.5	2	1.1	1	1.7	—	—	—	—
Prefer change to semester	1,727		182		60		31		42	
Yes	676	39.1	103	56.6	31	51.7	4	12.9	6	14.3
No	931	53.9	73	40.1	28	46.7	27	87.1	33	78.6
No response	120	6.9	6	3.3	1	1.7	—	—	3	7.1

^aThe survey was sent in February 1986 to the 2,722 regular faculty members (tenured and tenure-track) on the Twin Cities campus asking for a response by March 12, 1986. A postcard reminder was sent a week later to the non-respondents asking them to respond by April 2. Because of the large number (about 100) of the faculty who called to say they had not received the original survey, the return deadline was set at April 14, at which time 1,727 (63.5%) had been returned.

^bThe survey and cover letter signed by Chancellor Heller were sent on February 28, 1986 to all faculty members on the Duluth campus. A total of 182 questionnaires were forwarded for analysis, representing a response rate of 45.7 percent.

^cThe survey and cover letter signed by Chancellor Imholte were sent to the 84 regular faculty members on the Morris campus. Of those, 670 (71.4%) were returned.

^dThe survey and cover letter were sent to 51 faculty members on the Waseca campus. Of those, 31 (60.8%) were returned.

^eThe survey and cover letter were sent to 58 faculty members on the Crookston campus. Of those, 42 (72.4%) were returned.

WILLIAM BOYLAN, Chr.
Faculty Affairs Committee

VII. STEERING COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86

The Steering Committee is comprised of the eight Twin Cities faculty and five Twin Cities student members of the Senate Consultative Committee. The Steering Committee conducted its Assembly business within meetings of the Senate Consultative Committee, and found no need to convene separately on any issue.

The major items of business were child care; whether the campus should move to a semester calendar; coordinating lower division education; civil service representation on Assembly committees; and study which preceded the North Central Association's re-creditation site visit; self-committee appointments and nominations.

Committee actions and positions taken on these items are described in the Senate Consultative Committee's annual report to the Senate.

DEON D. STUTHMAN
Chair

VIII. HONORS PROGRAMS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87

The Honors Programs Committee met seven times during the academic year and also took part in the first University-wide honors retreat (October 4-5, 1985) organized by the Office of Educational Development Programs (OEDP). The committee heard a follow-up report on the retreat which was based on a questionnaire mailed by OEDP to sixteen University of Minnesota colleges or units participating in the retreat. Although not all of them presently have an honors program, most see the usefulness of it. Except for two, those that do not have an honors program are considering it for the future.

In view of the University-wide interest in honors program, this committee discussed the possibility of expanding the responsibility of the present committee to include that for the whole University. After a presentation of the committee views to the Senate Committee on Committees, the chair of the Honors Programs Committee was invited to submit a new description of membership, duties and responsibilities of a proposed Senate Committee on Honors Program. This has now been done.

The Honors Program Committee discussed goals for long-term study and chose two. These are to (a) examine existing honors programs to determine the contents of an "honors course" and explore avenues for cross-collegiate cooperation and (b) study reward systems for faculty at comparable institutions for participating in honors programs and make recommendations for the Twin Cities Campus. It is hoped that the 1986-87 committee will continue these discussions.

SUBIR K. BANERJEE
Chair

IX. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86

The Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) met more than once per month during 1985-86, beginning with its usual all-day retreat in September.

At its Fall Retreat, ACIA had as its guests President Kenneth Keller and Dr. William Atchley, former President of Clemson University who had resigned in disagreement with the Clemson Board of Regents about athletics. The retreat was devoted to a discussion of some of the fundamental issues facing intercollegiate athletics.

Among the specific issues ACIA dealt with during 1985-86 were these:

- Approved the request to participate in the Independence Bowl in Shreveport, LA, in December.
- Following discussions over several meetings, requested the athletic directors to present to ACIA for its approval a drug testing, counseling, and education plan for student athletes.
- Examined the procedure for reviewing academic credentials of prospective student athletes during recruiting.
- Dealt with several allegations of NCAA rules violations (one involving a student athlete, one involving boosters, and several involving questionable expenditures).

Two major issues discussed by ACIA at great length were freshman eligibility for competition and NCAA Proposition 48 (which requires that a student athlete achieve an SAT of 700 or ACT of 15 and a 2.0 in a high school core curriculum in order to be eligible as a freshman). The Committee met with President Keller to discuss these subjects, and voted to oppose any attempts to weaken Proposition 458. There has been no need yet to take a position on freshman eligibility although there doubtless will be in the near future.

Following the unfortunate events in Madison involving three male basketball players, ACIA met for a third time with President Keller. The Committee supported the President's decisions.

Four members of ACIA served as members of the President's Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics. By the end of 1985-86, ACIA intends to have acted on as many of the Task Force recommendations as it is able; any remaining items after June will be addressed in the summer or autumn of 1986. The committee expects to have a number of reports and action items on the agenda of the Assembly at its first meeting of 1986-87.

The committee has remained gravely concerned about the academic performance of male basketball players. Although ACIA has not yet had an opportunity to meet with Coach Haskins, the Committee has communicated its concern to him and is hopeful that the situation will improve. ACIA will continue to monitor closely the academic performance of the men's basketball team.

Other routine business was conducted, including review and approval of ticket prices and schedules, approval of awards, and directing the votes Minnesota cast at the January, 1986, NCAA Convention.

The Committee wished to note that it has some problems in ensuring that its policy of requiring ACIA faculty and student membership on search committees was observed in the instances of selecting new coaches in men's basketball and football.

JOHN P. CLARK
Chair

X. FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86

The Faculty Steering Committee membership consists of the eight Twin Cities faculty members of the Senate Consultative Committee. The Steering Committee was not convened separately but conducted its business within the meetings of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Twin Cities Campus business items this year were:

- Future role for General College under Commitment to Focus
- Coordination of Lower Division Education under Commitment to Focus
- Whether the campus should change to a semester calendar
- Committee appointments and nominations

The annual report to the Faculty Senate of the Faculty Consultative Committee describes our activities and positions on these matters.

In addition, the Steering Committee approved slightly revised calendars for 1986-87 and 1987-88 for forwarding from the Calendar Committee to the Assembly, but held back the proposed calendar for 1988-89 until a way could be found to restore at least one of the two lost instruction days.

DEON D. STUTHMAN
Chair

XI. OLD BUSINESS

XII. NEW BUSINESS

(15 minutes)

Please feel free to use this agenda item to comment on a topic you believe is of general interest to the Assembly. The Assembly is reminded that this entry in the agenda may be used to raise specific issues, concerns and/or ideas of general interest. A motion is not required. As much as anything, the Business and Rules Committee wishes to remind the Assembly that all ideas presented to the body need not flow from a committee.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, June 5, 1986

(Immediately following the Assembly meeting)

25 Law Building—Twin Cities Campus
305 Selvig Hall—Crocketon Campus
502 Darland Adm. Bldg.—Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus
Learning Resources Center Conference Room—Waseca Campus

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 202, including the President, 147 members of the faculty (including the Faculty Consultative Committee), and 54 students (including the Student Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (102) must be present. Advance notice is required for amendments to the constitution and 135 affirmative votes at one meeting or 102 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting. Advance notice is required for amendments to the bylaws and 102 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting.

Any member of the faculty and any student eligible to vote for senators shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the Senate. Only elected members or alternates, the Senate Consultative Committee and, in case of a tie, the Chair, shall be entitled to vote.

Representatives may designate any eligible alternates from their colleges, schools, or student constituencies as the alternates to serve in their places by written notice to the Clerk of the Senate prior to the commencement of any meeting of the Senate.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be available at each door of the meeting room, and members are asked to sign. A summary of attendance for the year will be included in the minutes of the last meeting of the year.

RULES

Rules will be available at the door.

I. COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE, 1986-87

Action (3 minutes)

These nominations are in addition to those approved at the May 15 meeting.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM & REPOSIBILITY APPEALS Students: Sandra Braman, Scott Prichard, Deborah Shands, Gretchen Slosser.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY Students: Susan Collison, Brenda Ellingboe, Crystal Hanscome, Leisa Krych, Robert Myers.

EXTENSION & COMMUNITY PROGRAMS Students: Christine DeMoss, David Lenander, Kerry Uker, 2 to be named.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION Students: Migual Carter, Kim Didier, David Lykins, Virginia Mills.

LIBRARY Students: Steve Boland, 3 to be named.

PHYSICAL PLANT & SPACE ALLOCATION Students: Daniel Haley, 2 to be named.

RESEARCH Students: John Albrecht, Nancy Guthrie, Todd Juneau.

SOCIAL CONCERNS Students: Patricia Liefert, Jodie Parizek, Richard Scattergood, Audrey Spiess, Jon Tynjala.

SUMMER SESSIONS Students: Pamela Freese, 4 to be named.

INFORMATION:

CONSULTATIVE Students: Partick Durbin, Brenda Ellingboe, Donald Peterson (UMC), Roy St. Laurent, Andrew Seitel, Bruce Vandal, Bruce Williams (UMD), two to be named (UMM and UMW)

II. REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT

(5 minutes)

III. RESEARCH COMMITTEE

INDUSTRY-UNIVERSITY INTERACTIONS

Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Senate approve the following guidelines on interactions with industry:

(Copies of the full document have been mailed to all senators; anyone desiring a copy should call 625-9369.)

GUIDELINES ON INTERACTIONS WITH INDUSTRY

SUMMARY

The following are intended to provide flexible, reasonable, principles and parameters to guide the University's interactions with industry.

Monitoring Activity

The University should develop a statement that requires the submission of all externally-sponsored proposals and resulting contracts, grants, and other forms of agreement, excepting only faculty consulting arrangements and unrestricted gifts and bequests, through the Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration, for its prompt review, following departmental and collegiate review and approval.

Openness of Research

A. Research conducted by faculty under industry sponsorship must maintain the University's open teaching and research environment and adhere to the University's policy prohibiting secrecy in research. The University and its faculty must not enter relations with industry resulting in situations tending to stifle the willingness of those involved to discuss the research openly.

B. Departmental chairs, directors, deans, and the administration, must review any new, proposed, or on-going faculty-industry interactions which might compromise the University's open teaching and research environment. Those in the line of reviewing University-industry relationships—department chairs, directors, deans and those in the Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration—should investigate and seek to resolve all potential problems. Concerns regarding violation of these guidelines should be brought to the attention of the appropriate administrative entity for resolution.

C. Faculty must have the right to disseminate their research results. The University prohibits sponsors from abridging this basic right. However, the University and faculty may accept reasonable delays in publication, to enable sponsors or the University to review for proprietary or patent protection. Such reasonable delays customarily are limited to ninety (90) days, with flexibility to extend if circumstances warrant and if the Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration, the faculty member/s involved, and the industrial sponsors all agree.

D. Faculty must formally inform civil service employees and students involved in industry-sponsored projects of all contract and grant terms affecting them, including any delays in publication owing to sponsor prior review of manuscripts and any obligations of confidentiality.

Appropriateness of Research

A. Since the integrity and scientific excellence of principal investigators, departmental chairs or directors, and deans ultimately safeguard the quality and relevance of all research and graduate training, all three, and personnel in the Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration, must promptly review all industrial proposals, new or renewal. In the absence of external peer review, such internal review must ensure that all industrial con-

tracts and grants, or other forms of relationships, conform to departmental and collegiate missions and maintain the breadth and quality of research creditable to the University. Questions regarding the appropriateness of industrial contracts and grants, or other forms of relationships, that cannot be resolved at the departmental or collegiate level could be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Research, ad hoc groups, or other forms as appropriate.

B. As part of its research, training, and public service missions, the University encourages faculty-industry interactions that enable faculty to pursue projects within their fields of interest and in keeping with their departmental and collegiate missions. Faculty have the freedom to undertake research, training, or public service, projects and to seek sponsorship of their liking, and must not be influenced in any way to accept either not of their own choosing.

Conflicts of Interest—Faculty

1) When accepting support from industrial sponsors, faculty must disclose all significant, directly related commercial connections and financial interests in such sponsors. In addition, in situations where faculty's immediate family have such commercial connections and financial interest, disclosure must also be made. The Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration will revise the University BA #23 form to facilitate such disclosures.

2) As faculty-industry relationships increase with a growing desire for consultancies, faculty must continue to observe the University consulting policy.

3) Departmental chairs or directors, deans, and the Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration must review and resolve any faculty conflicts of interest or conflicts of commitment.

4) The University should consider developing a formal conflicts of interest policy, utilizing these recommendations and others, to cover additional circumstances.

Conflicts of Interests—University

1. Where appropriate, the University may accept equity in companies as complete or partial payment for transferring University discoveries to such companies.

2. The University may designate an individual to hold membership on the board of directors of a company in which the University holds equity, and accordingly such individual must respect the obligations of a board member of that company.

3. Department chairs, directors, deans, and members of the University's central administration holding such membership shall absent themselves from all financial and other decisions that could influence the University's relations with such companies.

4. Where the University's direct financial involvement in a company would be considered a conflict, but where the University should maintain an interest in a company, utilization of an organization that would put the University in an "arm's length" relationship with the company should be considered. Such an organization might include the University of Minnesota Foundation, a separate University research foundation or institute.

5. When external entities raise funds for University research through offerings that solicit memberships, partnership shares, or equity positions, from members of the public, the University and faculty must scrupulously avoid the endorsement of any such offering and statement of potential research results. The University's prior written consent must be obtained to use its name in any way for advertising purposes.

Commitments of University Equipment and Personnel

A. When allowing industry to utilize University facilities, the University shall make certain that industry indemnifies the University for all liabilities arising from such use; that industry pays full costs incurred; and that such use does not interfere with University research, training, or public service programs.

B. The University will not knowingly compete with local private industry providing services similar to the University's.

Indirect Costs

The University should develop fair, flexible, operating practices that seek to recover full indirect costs but which recognize countervailing factors.

Transfer or Rights in Discoveries

The patent policy should be reviewed to ensure that it is comprehensive in scope and encompassing all discoveries, fair to the University, its inventors, and industry recipients of the discoveries, and flexible enough to meet the varying needs of the University, its faculty, and industry.

PAUL GASSMAN
Chair

IV. RESEARCH COMMITTEE

PATENT AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER POLICY

Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Senate approve the following revised patent and technology transfer policy:

SUMMARY

The impact of technical change on society is increasing and all aspects of this change are receiving increased attention at the University. New technologies are an important part of economic growth and University research plays a key role in the development of new technology. New types of intellectual property protection, such as that provided by the Chip Mask Protection Act and by the expanding coverage of patents (especially in the areas of software and biotechnology), are available for technologies developed at the University. Technology transfer by the University thus becomes an increasingly important component in the University's objectives or education, research and public service.

In response to the growing societal needs for effective technology transfer a new University policy has been developed with the primary aim of providing a favorable environment under which technology transfer in all its forms can occur. The policy covers virtually all persons at the University except students who are not engaged in sponsored research or otherwise employed by the University and consultants, who will be covered by their consulting agreements.

The University fosters an atmosphere of freedom in academic pursuits. Technology transfer at the University will therefore depend upon a free and willing participation of the developer of new technology consistent with contractual obligations entered into under funding arrangements.

If a development is made under funding where there is no arrangement requiring disclosure and disposition, and the developers do not wish to protect and commercialize the development, the policy imposes no obligations concerning that development. On the other hand, if the developers do wish to protect and commercialize that development, then the University has the right to acquire title to the development. The University must either acquire title and use its best efforts to protect and commercialize the development, or it must waive its rights to the development and the developers may then proceed as they wish.

If a development is not made under specific funding, the developers have no obligations to the University under the proposed policy. They may freely pursue commercialization of the development. This category includes developments made with *general* contributions from the University (e.g., general salary, support of facilities, general purchase of equipment, etc.).

The policy also covers formulae for the distribution of net income derived from technology transfer arrangements. In the most common case of revenues from licensing a patent, net income is divided equally between the University, the unit from which the development came (College and Laboratory) and the developers. In all cases an equitable distribution is proposed based on the relative input to the development and recognizing the critical role of individual University personnel in the innovative process.

The University Office of Patents and Licensing is responsible for implementing the policy. The University Patent and Technology Transfer Council is responsible for interpretation of the policy and for the development of any proposed policy changes.

PATENT AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER POLICY

1. PREAMBLE

The three basic purposes of the University are education, research, and public service. This policy is intended to advance these purposes by providing means to transfer University developed technologies directly to external parties for beneficial use and to obtain and distribute income from such transfers. To accomplish this it is necessary to: (i) encourage faculty to identify and disclose technologies developed at the University; (ii) protect these technologies through patents, copyrights, semiconductor chip mask registrations, the Plant Protection Act, and other suitable means; (iii) advance beneficial public use of these technologies by effecting transfers under suitable agreements; (iv) derive income from such transfers to be used to support technology protection and transfer, advance University research and education, and compensate the University developers for their contributions to the development and transfer of technology; and (v) obtain recognition for the University and the University developers for advancing technology beneficial to society.

2. DEFINITIONS

The following terms shall have the indicated definitions throughout this policy and shall appear in upper case letters.

a. **PERSONNEL** shall mean all persons employed or otherwise compensated by the University, including faculty, visiting faculty and researchers, staff, civil service employees, research and teaching assistants, residents, fellows and trainees. Personnel shall not include consultants to the University.

b. **UNIVERSITY FUNDS** shall mean funds provided by the University for the specific purpose of supporting research. Typically this support may come from grant programs administered by the Graduate School, College or Department, the Office of International Programs, or the Center for Educational Development. Additionally, this support may be from funds received by the University through federal and state appropriations to various university units.

c. **UNIVERSITY ADMINISTERED FUNDING** shall mean funding provided to the University by an external entity to support research. Typically, such funding is provided by an agency of the federal government, the State of Minnesota, or private sources such as industry or foundations.

d. **DEVELOPMENT** shall mean the result of research by PERSONNEL yielding such products as inventions, discoveries, apparatus, devices, processes, computer hardware, computer software, plants, organisms, genetic material, etc., and falling into one of the following categories:

CATEGORY (1) A DEVELOPMENT involving the use of UNIVERSITY FUNDS or UNIVERSITY ADMINISTERED FUNDING where disclosure and disposition of DEVELOPMENTS are required by the terms of the funding arrangement.

CATEGORY (2) A DEVELOPMENT involving the use of UNIVERSITY FUND or UNIVERSITY ADMINISTERED FUNDING where disclosure and disposition of DEVELOPMENTS are not required by the terms of the funding arrangement.

CATEGORY (3) A DEVELOPMENT not involving the use of UNIVERSITY FUNDS or UNIVERSITY ADMINISTERED FUNDING.

e. **DEVELOPERS** shall mean all PERSONNEL who produce a DEVELOPMENT (e.g., the inventor of an invention upon which a patent application is filed, the author of a work upon which copyright is obtained, etc.).

f. **TRANSFEREE** means any legally constituted organization or individual that acquired rights in a DEVELOPMENT under a license from the University.

g. **NET INCOME** means the gross monetary payments the University receives as a result of transferring rights in a DEVELOPMENT less the University's out-of-pocket costs for protecting, developing, and transferring that DEVELOPMENT.

3. APPLICATION OF POLICY

a. This policy shall be a condition of employment from the time that this policy becomes effective and applies to all PERSONNEL.

b. This policy applies to all DEVELOPMENTS whether or not such developments are patentable, copyrightable, or protectable in another manner. However, DEVELOPMENTS do not include matter that is primarily educational, literary, or artistic in nature, except where the research sponsor required application of this policy.

4. RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

a. **Publication:** Nothing in this policy shall be construed as affecting their rights of PERSONNEL to publish. An appropriate means of protection of a DEVELOPMENT may require a limited period of nondisclosure in order to secure certain rights. PERSONNEL may agree to observe such nondisclosure requirement.

b. **Category (1) DEVELOPMENTS:** DEVELOPERS shall fully disclose to the University all DEVELOPMENTS made under a funding arrangement as required by that arrangement. The University shall handle such DEVELOPMENTS in accordance with the terms of the funding arrangement and this policy. The University may require the DEVELOPERS of such DEVELOPMENTS to assign title in such DEVELOPMENTS and to sign all papers and provide all other assistance necessary to effect the University's obligations under the funding arrangement.

c. **Category (2) DEVELOPMENTS:** For DEVELOPMENTS where disclosure and disposition is not required under a funding arrangement, participation by DEVELOPERS in the technology transfer process at the University is voluntary. However, if DEVELOPERS elect to protect and/or commercially exploit their DEVELOPMENTS, they must first fully disclose in confidence those DEVELOPMENTS to the University. The University shall have the first right to acquire title to such DEVELOPMENTS.

d. **Category (3) DEVELOPMENTS:** Participation by DEVELOPERS of Category (3) DEVELOPMENTS in the technology transfer process at the University is strictly voluntary. Obtaining protection for such DEVELOPMENTS is complementary to the University's mission, is compatible with academic pursuits, such as publishing, and enhances the potential for beneficial use of the DEVELOPMENT. Accordingly, DEVELOPERS are urged to consider utilizing the University's technology transfer service.

e. **Category (2) and (3) DEVELOPMENTS:** The University shall evaluate each disclosed DEVELOPMENT and shall, within two weeks of the disclosure, contact the DEVELOPERS to discuss disposition of the DEVELOPMENT. If the University proceeds with protection or commercialization of the DEVELOPMENT, it will require the DEVELOPERS to assign title in the DEVELOPMENT to the University. The DEVELOPERS shall sign all papers and provide all assistance necessary to enable the University to obtain patent, copyright, chip mask, or other suitable protection for a DEVELOPMENT assigned to the University. DEVELOPERS shall also provide reasonable assistance to the University in identifying potential TRANSFEREES and in providing potential TRANSFEREES with information concerning such DEVELOPMENT. The University shall, at its own expense, use its best efforts to suitably protect and transfer DEVELOPMENTS assigned to the University. The University shall keep DEVELOPERS fully informed of such efforts. If the University determines that it will not proceed with the DEVELOPMENT and if it is permitted by the funding arrangement, the University will waive title to the DEVELOPMENT to the DEVELOPERS.

f. **Scope of Protection:** The nature and extent of the protection sought shall be decided by the Office of Patents and Licensing in consultation with PERSONNEL.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR CATEGORY (1) AND (2) DEVELOPMENTS

a. **Generally:** Out-of-pocket cost of assistance to be provided by DEVELOPERS under 4.b. and 4.e. shall be approved in advance and reimbursed by the University. The University shall share income derived from a DEVELOPMENT as provided below. Gross monetary income received by the University from a DEVELOPMENT shall first be used by the University to reimburse itself for out-of-pocket costs associated with that DEVELOPMENT.

b. **Distribution of NET INCOME from DEVELOPMENTS upon which a Patent Application is Filed:** NET INCOME from such DEVELOPMENTS shall be divided as follows:

(i) 33 1/3% to the Office of Patents and Licensing. The share of Patents and Licensing shall be used to cover the UNIVERSITY's out-of-pocket costs for technology protection, development and transfer activities concerning other DEVELOPMENTS not otherwise covered. The remaining portion of such share shall be used to support University activities.

(ii) 33 1/3% to the unit from which the DEVELOPMENT came, to be divided 8% to the DEVELOPER'S college, and 25 1/3% to direct support of the DEVELOPER'S research. In the event that the DEVELOPER leaves employment by the UNIVERSITY, the latter share reverts to the DEVELOPER'S department.

(iii) 33 1/3% to be divided among the DEVELOPERS of the DEVELOPMENT. The DEVELOPERS and any others shall share in proportions agreeable among the DEVELOPERS.

c. **Distribution of NET INCOME from DEVELOPMENTS upon which no Patent Application is Filed:** NET INCOME from such DEVELOPMENTS shall be divided as follows:

(i) 25% to the Office of Patent and Licensing.

(ii) 75% to be divided among the DEVELOPERS. The DEVELOPERS and any others shall share in proportions agreeable among the DEVELOPERS.

6. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR CATEGORY (3) DEVELOPMENTS

Gross monetary income received from such DEVELOPMENTS shall be first used by the University to cover out-of-pocket costs associated with that DEVELOPMENT. NET INCOME shall be distributed as appropriate to the specific situation as agreed to by the DEVELOPER and the Office of Patents and Licensing. As a general rule for DEVELOPMENTS on which a patent application is filed, the NET INCOME will be distributed 50% to the DEVELOPERS and 50% to the Office of Patents and Licensing.

7. ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR CATEGORY (1), (2) AND (3) DEVELOPMENTS

a. **Distribution of Other Compensation:** The University may, as circumstances warrant, negotiate forms of compensation other than monetary income for a transferred DEVELOPMENT (e.g., shares of stock). In such circumstances the University shall make suitable arrangements for compensation of all persons and units having a right to share in NET INCOME, with the express agreement of all such persons and units.

b. **Other Payments to DEVELOPERS:** At its discretion, the University may pay DEVELOPERS for extraordinary efforts in identifying potential TRANSFEREES and interesting them in the DEVELOPMENT.

8. FUNDING TERMS

The obligations and procedures outlined by this policy are subject to the terms and conditions of any funding arrangement governing the disposition of a DEVELOPMENT. In the case of arrangements with industrial or other for-profit sponsors, the University shall not agree to any terms that give such sponsor substantial rights in DEVELOPMENTS without first consulting with the principal investigators. Generally, industry sponsors will acquire some rights in DEVELOPMENTS made under research projects they fund.

9. TRANSFER TERMS

The University will seek to transfer DEVELOPMENTS for commercialization to maximize their public utility and to obtain a fair return to the DEVELOPERS and the University for distribution in accordance with this policy. While it is impossible to define all of the situations that may arise and the appropriate terms for such situations, the following principles shall generally apply:

a. The University shall not grant rights to a DEVELOPMENT without fair compensation in the form of royalties and/or other consideration, which may include funding of the research.

b. The University may grant exclusive rights (including a grant of title) in a DEVELOPMENT to effect transfer. The University shall provide terms in the exclusive agreement that will obligate the party obtaining rights to adequately exploit the DEVELOPMENT to meet a market. The University shall also retain a right to terminate the exclusive agreement and reacquire all rights to the DEVELOPMENT if the party having exclusive rights does not adequately exploit the DEVELOPMENT.

c. The University may grant rights to DEVELOPMENTS under more favorable terms than in (9.a) and (9.b) above where special circumstances warrant (e.g., a project utilizing base technology contributed by the sponsor or a situation where there are sufficient assurances that a DEVELOPMENT will be adequately exploited without the terms specified in (9.b)).

d. The University may enter into agreements with organizations that will themselves attempt to transfer a DEVELOPMENT for commercialization.

10. OFFICE OF PATENTS AND LICENSING

All disclosures of DEVELOPMENTS shall be made to the University Office of Patents and Licensing. It is the responsibility of the Office of Patents and Licensing to administer disclosures and DEVELOPMENTS in accordance with work within this policy and seek approval from the Patent and Technology Transfer Council for variations where the provisions of the policy are inadequate or inappropriate for a specific situation.

11. EFFECTIVE DATE

This policy shall become effective when adopted by the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the University Senate.

PATENT AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AGREEMENT

I have read and understand the attached Patent and Technology Transfer Policy. In consideration of the provisions of that policy and my employment at the University of Minnesota, I agree to abide by that policy.

I agree to disclose to the University all technical development that I conceive or develop with the use of University funds or University administered funding in all cases in which I decide to seek protection for that development through patents, copyrights, or other means or have decided to seek commercial exploitation of that development. I also agree to disclose to the University all technical developments I make under a University administered funding arrangement when required by that arrangement. For all developments I have agreed to disclose under the previous two sentences, I agree to sign all papers and provide all assistance necessary to give the University title to such developments, enable the University to obtain patent, copyright, or other suitable protection for such developments and enable the University to satisfy the terms of any applicable funding arrangement. I also agree to provide reasonable assistance to the University in identifying companies that may be interested in such developments and in providing information to such companies.

I understand that nothing in the Patent and Technology Transfer Policy or this Agreement restricts my right to publish the results or research I perform at the University. I also understand that I am not required to disclose technical development to the University made without the use of University funds or University administered funding.

I understand that this Agreement does not give me any rights to developments not conceived by me.

Name (Please print or type) _____

Date _____ Signature _____

Social Security Number _____

V. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
DECEASED STUDENTS RECOGNITION
Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend Article I, Section 7, of the bylaws by appending the following: In like fashion, it shall be a function of the clerk of the University Senate to obtain after convenient intervals but at least once annually from the Office of Registration and Records of other official sources a complete list of those registered students who have died during the preceding interval. The clerk shall include the names of these students in the agenda of the Senate for recognition by it.

ROY ST. LAURENT, Chr.
Student Consultative Committee
DEON D. STUTHMAN, Chr.
Consultative Committee

ROLE OF THE SENATE

A good understanding of the Senate is essential to effective use of our governance system. For in a rough sense all our other governance bodies are subsets of the Senate.

SSCG strongly believes that as the most broadly represented body in the University, legislative authority correctly resides within the University Senate. The size of this body not only commands legislative power, but it also dictates the ideal format for the Senate, a forum for debate. To enable this type of discussion the Senate depends on its components to bring forward thoroughly investigated proposals. If used properly, the Senate is a useful forum to establish policy and voice concerns.

RECOMMENDATION I: Clarify the ability of all constituent bodies to deliberate on issues and to adopt or promulgate advisory resolutions on the initiative of that body, yet not claim more exclusive legislative authority than that which the Senate has delegated to it.

—Amend bylaws (see appendix 2)

—Should the need arise, the respective steering body of either the Student or Faculty Senate should ensure that there are adequate meetings for that component to form opinions.

RECOMMENDATION II: Ensure that the Senate is as discussion oriented as possible.

—Encourage members of the University community to submit resolutions to the Senate or through its committees.

—Establish a fund to provide student coordinate campus senators the opportunity to physically attend Senate meetings. Currently used telephone hookups are not conducive to participation in the Senate debate by the coordinate campuses.

—Encourage SCC and Business and Rules to plan Senate agendas so as to facilitate debate.

COMMUNICATIONS

This University is among the most decentralized large institutions of higher education in the country. Paradoxically, and fortunately, it is also one of the most consultative. It is characterized by a large number of formal and informal bodies, empowered in a number of ways, to recommend general policy or specific action or to administer academic and support units.

The consultative nature of the University suggests that decisions made by the formal bodies reflect adequate communication between all involved units and individuals. In many instances, this is not the case. The governance system is complex, and necessarily so. The price for complexity is lack of adequate communication.

Constant effort to improve communication is imperative if the governance system is to function well. All parties need to have access to the same information in order to make enlightened decisions based on understanding of objectives, methods, advantages and disadvantages of options, and possible outcomes. The frame of reference in which a decision is made affects future decisions and decisions made by other parties and on other issues.

The authoritative line of governance, beyond the collegiate level, at the University starts with the faculty and students and moves to either the Senate or the appropriate assembly, thence to central administration and to the Regents. In the normal progress of an issue, there is diversion through one or more committees, which report to the Senate or Assembly for action or information.

Communications problems lie with failure on the part of committees to understand or implement their charge, to have been given historical perspective on the work of their committees, to plan agendas for the year, and to be in sufficient contact with the Consultative Committee to function in concert with other committees' activities. In addition, elected members of governance bodies apparently neither seek counsel of their constituencies or keep them adequately informed.

RECOMMENDATION I: Encourage faculty/academic professional members and students to know and understand University governance and how individuals can bring items of business to the Senate.

—Publish a handbook, available to all members of the community, that informs and establishes the authority of the governance units, their accountability, and the lines of communication.

—Specify the ways in which items of business can be brought to the Senate, i.e., through one's senators, to the Senate Consultative Committee, or directly to the floor.

—Encourage the continuation of the Senate Consultative Committee newsletter, at least to all senators, with the recommendation that they be circulated to constituencies.

—Ensure that all governance documents are readily accessible to all members of the University community by being placed in libraries system-wide.

RECOMMENDATION II: Require that reports of Senate committees go through the Senate if action is to be taken based on those reports. The Senate cannot and must not be held responsible for actions taken on reports of its committees without having had the opportunity to discuss and vote on them.

RECOMMENDATION III: Expect and require that the Senate Consultative Committee exercise its steering function with regard to committee reports, such that conflicting reports do not go forward to central administration.

RECOMMENDATION IV: Ensure both continuity and informed opinion in committee deliberations, insofar as is possible with ever changing membership.

—Provide that each committee is assigned at least one member of central administration.

—Require annual reports of each committee, to be filed with the Clerk of the Senate and made available to each succeeding chair, along with records and minutes.

—Require that minutes be kept of all meetings, to be filed with the Clerk of the Senate and made available to each succeeding chair by predecessor.

RECOMMENDATION V: Retain the concept of the organic University Senate, but provide for both majority and minority expression of opinion if there is conviction of difference on the basis of student versus faculty/academic professional groups.

—Allow voting on an issue along student versus faculty/academic professional lines upon motion by a minority opinion voter, requiring a two-thirds majority of the voting membership.

RECOMMENDATION VI: Encourage communication between assemblies on all campuses and the Senate.

—Provide funding for student senators to attend Senate meetings.

—Encourage coordinate campus assemblies to make their senators members of their groups.

ORIENTATION

In order that the University governance system be effective, a proper orientation for those involved is a necessity. If individuals are to participate fully in the deliberations that take place in University governance, they must be empowered at all levels so that both their time and the time of others is not fruitlessly spent.

In a governance structure as megalithic as the University's, it is very important to involve and sustain the interest of a large number of faculty/academic professionals and students in the processes of governance. The sheer number of committees practically ensures that no one has a clear, timely perspective of the intricate workings of the system as a whole and all of its parts. Any individual new to the system can be easily overwhelmed by its enormity.

Confusion and ignorance of the system can lead to disappearance of that individual from the system. Sheer enthusiasm on the part of new members cannot always carry them through the learning process.

The following recommendations provide an outline of procedures to inform and orient all participants in University-wide governance.

RECOMMENDATION I: That the Senate Consultative Committee and the Facilitative Committee meet prior to the openings of the fall quarter to plan one or more orientation meetings of chairs of Senate and Twin Cities Assembly committees.

RECOMMENDATION II: That the Senate Consultative Committee, with the assistance of the Facilitative Committee, conduct one or more orientation meetings for chairs of Senate and Twin Cities Assembly committees no later than the second week of the fall quarter, with the following objectives:

—Familiarize the chairs with the organization of the system and the rationale for its hierarchy.

—Explain the roles of the officers of the Senate and the Assembly.

—Sketch the broad policy issues that will be before the two bodies in the coming year and describe agendas that may be relevant to committee activities.

—Describe operational matters of committee activities.

—Make known budgetary facts that relate to committees, including the availability of budgets and staffing to committees.

—Make known the location and availability of previous committee records.

—Assist committee chairs in understanding their roles in the governance structure and how to implement their specific charges, as described in the Constitutions and Bylaws.

—Provide a forum for identification between committee chairs of the issues and agenda items they may have in common.

RECOMMENDATION III: That committee chairs call orientation and organizational meetings of their committees early in the fall quarter in order to:

—Empower committee members by conveying to them information received at the orientation sessions.

—Facilitate the timely integration of new members. (It should be noted that Student Committee on Committees provides one such opportunity in the spring after new senators have been elected.

—Discuss meeting times and arrive at a quarterly calendar that will make it possible for both faculty/academic professional and student members to attend.

RECOMMENDATION IV: That at not later than a second meeting, the committee make the following decisions, insofar as is possible:

—Establish goals of the committee based on duties and responsibilities outlined in the Constitutions, Bylaws, and Rules.

—Agree on an agenda that is realistic in terms of priorities and expectations of the governance leadership, and consistent with past actions of the committee.

RECOMMENDATION V: That committee chairs make themselves accessible to all members of their committees, particularly students and new members, for information on any aspect of committee operation or activity.

RECOMMENDATION VI: That, at the first Senate meeting of the academic year, the Senate Consultative Committee Chair make a presentation encapsulating the differing roles of the Senate and campus bodies, the rationale for the hierarchy, and the ways in which committees are appointed, and inviting members to seek his or her advice or counsel on any aspect of University governance.

ACCOUNTABILITY

In this section emphasis is given to the importance of delegation and follow-up to effective governance. Individually and collectively, performance is at its best when subject to challenge. These recommendations supply that challenge by ensuring committees have important responsibilities and that someone or some group is monitoring their performance. The goal is to strengthen the linkages within the existing governance structure so that even "special issues" can be acted on effectively.

RECOMMENDATION I: The President of the University should report to the Senate on the status of its recommendations at least once a year.

RECOMMENDATION II: The Senate Planning Committee should monitor the progress of important recommendations of the Senate and advise the President which are essential to report on to the Senate.

RECOMMENDATION III: The President and SCC must make every effort to delegate important and timely issues to committees rather than task forces. SSCG asserts that "weak" committees can only be strengthened by having the opportunity to prove themselves. Additional resources or an augmented membership may be required.

RECOMMENDATION IV: The Senate/Assembly Committee chairs should take responsibility for communicating with SCC and Committee on Committees, setting the agenda and timeline for committee projects, and notifying members of meetings and deadlines.

RECOMMENDATION V: Committee on Committees should monitor the relevance and contribution of committees to University governance.

RECOMMENDATION VI: Each Senate/Assembly Committee should clarify the responsibilities and duties of its committee members. In the case of repetitive absenteeism or neglect of duties, a member should be removed by a majority vote of its membership, or relevant steering committee in the case of Senate officers. Absenteeism, neglect of duties, or removal should be reported by the committee chair to committee on Committees.

RECOMMENDATION VII: Strongly encourage SCC and departmental faculties which consider promotion and tenure to recognize governance contributions.

STRUCTURE

Despite the size and complexity of the governance system, the SSCG felt strongly that most problems are a result of insufficient use of the present structure and are not a reflection of a structural problem.

The Minnesota tradition values consultation and participative decision-making. The chair of one important committee that met with SSCG asserted that Minnesota is known across the country for its good governance. This report reflects the desire to continue to move in that direction.

The current structure has three key strengths upon which any changes should be based: 1) the hierarchical network of committees, 2) the consultative links with the administration, and 3) mechanisms to create special committees so as to minimize the need for task forces. By enhancing the communication links between committees, assigning appropriate administrators to each committee, and insuring that committees have significant responsibilities, governance will be strengthened.

Strengthening the governance structure also may require elimination or modification of committees that are no longer necessary and are seen as dangling on the fringes of the governance systems. The committee surveyed all Senate and Twin Cities Assembly committee chairs, asking their views on a range of topics. (A copy of the survey form and the summary of the responses are in the Appendix.) The responses are available to the Committee on Committees and Business and Rules upon request.

RECOMMENDATION I: That the Senate Consultative Committee formalize the Facilitative Committee by designating those committees whose chair should constitute such a committee and define its duties and responsibilities.

RECOMMENDATION II: That the Committee on Committees look carefully at the Senate and Assembly committees listed below, with regard to their importance to the governance systems. If it is determined that they are important and therefore needed, their membership and their duties and responsibilities should be reviewed.

—Social Concerns.

—Student Affairs: suggest changing the name, with attendant membership and duties and responsibilities, to Undergraduate Education and the Student Experience.

—Extension and Community Programs and Summer Sessions: with both Continuing Education and Extension and Summer Session reporting to the same dean, there might be a rationale for combining the committees, although many other extension operations are also the province of the current Extension and Community Programs Committee.

—International Education: consider subsuming the Assembly Committee on International Students.

—Academic Freedom and Responsibility Appeals: one consultant to the SSCG observed that "a monstrosity of an appeals system" has been created.

—Educational Development: if this is solely an administrative committee, it may not need to be in the governance structure.

—Student Academic Support Services.

—Use of Human Subjects in Research; the committee is particularly concerned that the committee be reconstituted to attend to policy matters (the policy and administration functions of the committee should be more clearly separated).

—University-ROTC Relationships.

—Transportation and Parking; an Assembly Committee, could become a subcommittee of Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation.

—Book Store Advisory, its educational function should be emphasized.

Committee effectiveness is dependent upon function, tasks assigned, and expectation on the part of those assigning the tasks. Two principles could serve as criteria in determining whether a particular committee should be modified or deleted from or added to the governance structure: 1) there are significant responsibilities assigned to it; 2) committees in governance must either formulate or evaluate policy (e.g., committees should be more than a support group for an administrator).

If the appropriate committees are in place in the structure, the need for task forces can be limited to topics that are too broad in scope to be encompassed by one committee, or a committee can be augmented to handle a specific issue.

RECOMMENDATION III: That committee membership be constituted in terms of optimal numbers and best use of faculty and student experience, while at the same time avoiding conflict of interest.

—The Committee on Committees needs one additional faculty member, possibly designated to be from the St. Paul campus, and two additional student members.

—Student Affairs, given its present assignment, is unwieldy and should be reduced in size; it should be chaired by a student and provided staff support.

—Committee chairs should be current senators or have served within the last five years.

—The data base developed by the Committee on Committees, including the triennial survey of faculty interest, should be made available to and use by all bodies that appoint members of committees.

—Student employees of an area should be ineligible to serve on policy-making or regulatory committee of that same area.

RECOMMENDATION IV: That all Senate and Assembly committees be staffed to a degree commensurate with their responsibilities and that the Senate Consultative Committee determine staffing necessary to insure productivity and continuity.

RECOMMENDATION V: That voting privileges of academic professional members in the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Assembly be clarified in the constitutions and bylaws, by specifying those items on which such members may vote or may not vote.

VI. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT Information (5 minutes)

Members of Special Senate Committee on Governance: Eleanor Fenton, former Member of Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) and Committee on Committees; Steve Florman, Speaker of MSA; Linda Hanson, member of SCC, Chair of Special Senate Committee on Governance; Paul Murphy, member of SCC; Michael Rodriguez, Morris Student Body President; Andrew Seitel, Twin Cities Student Body President; Roy St. Laurent, member of SCC; Roderick Squires, Chair of Assembly Committee on Student Affairs; and Burnham Terrell, former member of Committee on Committees.

Staff Assistants: Laura Cavallo, Administrative Officer, MSA; Deb Felt, Researcher, MSA; and Mary Jane Plunkett, Consultant, Student Organization Development Center.

VII. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86 (2 minutes)

(NOTE: For a complete accounting of Consultative Committee activity, please see also the annual reports of the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) in the minutes of the Student Senate and of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) in the minutes of the Faculty Senate.)

The current academic year has been a vigorous one for the University's governance system, and a year in which a number of projects were undertaken jointly by the administration and the governance system. We salute President Kenneth H. Keller for his readiness to enter into these joint ventures.

The Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) met 10 times this year. Seven of those meetings included discussions with President Keller. The chairs and co-chairs of FCC and SSCC met monthly to plan the agenda for each upcoming meeting. There were fewer meetings of the full committee and more meetings of its component parts, the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Student Senate Consultative Committee, than had been the case in recent years. This meeting time design enabled each part to spend as much time as members wanted on issues of particular concern to that part; they exchanged minutes and reported to one another in the SCC meetings. The chairs and vice chairs of FCC and SSCC were to meet in late May to access these arrangements and make recommendations regarding next year's scheduling.

COMMITMENT TO FOCUS. The letters charging the special committees to make recommendations for implementing broad aspects of commitment to focus were jointly signed by President Keller and SCC chair Deon D. Stuthman. The SCC heard frequent reports on the work of the committees from the SCC member serving on each, and submitted comments and suggestions to the interim reports of the Preparation Requirements and the Lower Division Committees. SCC called an open forum for the University community on each of these two after their interim reports had been issued. SCC moved the Senate approve the preparation requirements; work on the lower division recommendations continued late into spring quarter. During the summer of 1985 and in the September retreat for committee chairs, SCC had encouraged all Senate and Assembly committees to monitor and, if they so desired, make recommendations on any of the basic CfF proposals to which their respective committees' charges had relevance.

CHILD CARE. Following an appeal to President Keller in June of 1985 by an *ad hoc* group on child care, he asked for governance involvement from the earliest stages in any new proposal. President Keller and the SCC jointly created a special committee, the president accepted the SCC's membership recommendations, and he and the SCC chair wrote and signed the letter of charge to the special committee. That committee, superbly chaired by Margery Durham, worked swiftly and intelligently to produce a report for the president and the SCC by early April. The president and SCC raised questions which Professor Durham answered to the fullest extent that available data permitted. The Consultative Committee moved that the Twin Cities Campus Assembly on June 5 support several aspects of implementation of the report's recommendations, including creating the staff position of Coordinator of University Child Care. SCC commends the committee, whose other members were John Adams, Michael Baizerman, Thomas Ewald, Vanne Hayes, Raleigh Kaminsky, Ronald Kubik, Shirley Moore, Stephanie Oskie, Paul Rosenblatt, Sue Smith-Cunnien, and Anne Truax. SCC and the Child Care Committee acknowledge with appreciation the staffing assistance of Cheryl Baldwin and Jim Elicker and the contributions of Shirley Raines and Associate Vice President Donald Zander of the Office of Student Affairs, Elizabeth Hopwood of the Student Intermediary Board; Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs John Wallace; Patricia Finstad, Director, West Bank Child Care Center; Jackie Spies, Director, Commonwealth Child Care Cooperative; and Francie Nelson of the University Capital Campaign.

OTHER DISCUSSIONS WITH THE PRESIDENT. The other topics which the Consultative Committee discussed in meetings with President Keller were the Task Force on Athletics Programs; the principles involved in forbidding or not forbidding accepting grants for strategic defense initiative-related research at the University; the use of unbudgeted sur-

pluses from University operations such as the bookstores; and the University's administrative structure for planning (discussion on the last included senior assistant to the president Richard Heydinger and Senate Planning Committee chair W. Donald Spring). In a joint meeting of SCC, the Senate Finance Committee, President Keller, and Vice President and Provost V. Rama Murthy, budgeting questions were discussed concerning policy on indirect cost recovery fund distribution, the criteria for programmatic retrenchment as part of the University's response to the state's unallotment, and the 1986-87 budget.

REVISING THE UNIVERSITY'S GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES. This important work, undertaken over a period of several years by Drs. Carol Pazandak and Phyllis Freier, was reviewed during 1985-86 by the Judicial Committee and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility Appeals, and is currently under review by Professor Fred Morrison to determine consistency with the tenure code. The SCC hopes for early fall distribution of the revised procedures to faculty members and to student senators and for action on them in the fall quarter Senate meeting.

CIVIL SERVICE REPRESENTATION IN CAMPUS AND UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE. SCC named a special committee of Professor C. Arthur Williams (Chair) from the Committee on Committees, Professor Caroline Czarnecki from the Business and Rules Committee, and Barry Bridges from the Civil Service Committee to evaluate the three-year experiment of non-voting civil service representation on several Senate and Assembly committees and to make recommendations for the future. The SCC and Committee on Committees accepted most of their recommendations, modified others, and moved in May that the Senate and Assembly bylaws and rules be amended to provide for new voting civil service membership on certain committees. SCC also instituted a new trial period of non-voting civil service representation on committees where heretofore there has been none: Senate Committee on Extension and Community Programs, and Assembly Committees on Convocation and the Arts, International Students, and Student Affairs. SCC expresses its appreciation to Professors Czarnecki and Williams and Mr. Bridges for their valuable service.

OTHER ACTION ITEMS:

—SCC named a Special Committee on Governance which has studied the use this University community makes of its governance structure and which in late spring reported its discoveries and recommendations on retaining the current structure and making better use of it. The SCC thanks the able chair and the other members for their thoughtful and extensive attention to this task and for their very positive suggestions. The committee consisted of Linda Hanson, chair, Eleanor Fenton, Steve Florman, Paul Murphy, Michael Rodriguez, Roy St. Laurent, Andrew Seitel, Roderick Squires, and Burnham Terrell. The staff assistants were Laura Cavallo, Deb Felt, and Mary Jane Plunkett. The special committee and SCC thank all the staff, students, and faculty members who came to discuss the issues with the committee, and all the Senate and Assembly committee chairs who took time to respond to the governance survey.

—SCC supported a resolution, which originated in the Senate Library Committee, for a reallocation to the Twin Cities Libraries acquisitions budget within this fiscal year, and was gratified that the reallocation was made.

—SCC requested the Senate to continue permission for FCC to close meetings when it deemed that necessary, and subject to particular constraints, and to permit the full SCC and the SSCC the same privilege. The Senate voted its approval.

—SCC made appointments and nominations for membership and chairmanship on several committees as specified in the Senate and Assembly bylaws.

ITEMS FOR MAJOR SCC DISCUSSION:

—University Libraries (with Senate Library Committee chair Brian Job and Vice President Murthy);

—The search for Academic Vice President and Provost (Note: SSCC and SSCC separately contributed search committee membership nominations and were to hold early June interviews with the finalists);

—The Report of the Page Committee on the Quality of Undergraduate Teaching and Learning and a subsequent progress report on implementation (with committee chair Roger Page and Gretchen Kreuter);

—The decennial accreditation reviewed: SCC reviewed the executive summary of the University's self-study report and received the complete report, and met informally with the nine members of the North Central Association's site visit team;

—University Relations project (the broadcasting of University tapes in slots during half-times of televised games, the University Communications Committee, and the new logo project) (with Associate Vice President George Robb);

—The University's physical environment (with President Keller; Vice President David Lilly; Associate Vice President William Thomas; Tony Aydinap, Director of Physical Plant Operations; and Harry Hogenkamp, chair of the Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation);

—Status of the interim system for advising the administration on computers and another information system: addressing need to establish a standing committee of the Senate to fill this role.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTIVITY. In mid-September the SCC sponsored a one-day retreat for the chairs of all Senate and Assembly committees. Part of the program was devoted to Commitment to Focus. The group heard from President Keller and the chairs of the three special CfF committees whose work was getting under way (Richard Heydinger, Coordinating Committee; William Hanson, Coordinating Twin Cities Campus Lower Division Education; and W. Andrew Collins, Preparation Requirements); the remainder of the meeting was devoted to an orientation to the workings of the Senate and Assembly and their committee structures.

SCC successfully pressed for accommodation among the other interested committees (Research, Educational Policy, and Finance) and central administration in shaping a motion to the Senate recommending a change in the policy concerning distribution of indirect cost recovery funds (ICRF). SCC exchanged minutes with the other committees of the Senate and Assembly; SCC sent its minutes to the faculty consultative/advisory committees of all the colleges and solicited from them recommendations for business the SCC should address.

The hard-working members of this year's committee were Ellen Bercheid, Patrick Durbin, Patricia Gearrick, Richard Goldstein, Sue Greenes, David Hamilton, Linda Hanson, Ron Kubik, Joseph Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin, Paul Murphy, Tim Pratt, Wanda Reinke, Irwin Rubenstein (associate chair), Roy St. Laurent, Frank Sorauf, and Bruce Williams.

A special word of thanks to our very effective executive assistant, Meredith Poppele.

**DEON STUTHMAN
Chair**

VIII. FINANCE COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86 (2 minutes)

The Senate Finance Committee is to provide a channel by which faculty/academic professional, student, and civil service ideas and concerns about programs, facilities, services, governance, faculty status, student affairs, and other matters may be voiced as biennial requests, and annual budgets are formulated, and as contingencies arise which require budgeting changes. It also serves as a consulting body to the Management Committee on budget issues. According to the Senate bylaws, the Finance Committee is to share responsibility for developing criteria according to which biennial and budgeting requests are examined and ranked, and to test the consistency of biennial requests and operating budgets against the criteria stipulated at the outset.

However, members have not found a way to bridge a gap which exists between the charge to the committee and what it is able to accomplish. The committee made repeated requests this year for the opportunity to participate in developing criteria for the 1987-89 biennial request and the 1986-87 budget and was disappointed that, although SFC was provided with a copy of the 1986-87 budget principles, strategy, and plan, the occasion did not present itself when SFC could contribute to formulating the rationale of either the budget or the legislative request. If the charge to the committee is no longer functional, we urge that representatives of the Senate and of central administration work together to clarify the role

the Senate Finance Committee is to play in the governance of the University.

The Finance Committee held eight regular meetings through May 15, 1986; several more meetings were to be scheduled in May and June. In addition, President Keller conferred informally with members of SFC on several occasions during the winter as the University was shaping its plan to respond to the state's unallocation.

On April 3 the Finance Committee received its first information outlining how the biennial budget request to the legislature would be constructed. In early May the SFC began a series of meetings with the Academic Vice President in which the SFC was to become informed on and make recommendations regarding the upcoming biennial request.

The single issue absorbing the largest amount of the committee's meeting time this year was the state's unallocation of some \$17.7 million, and the search for the least damaging way for the University to take that budget cut. The SFC unequivocally supported the University's borrowing plan. To minimize further the impact of the cuts on programs, and to help make distribution of the burden equitable, SFC recommended that as part of the up-front cut, a tax be levied both on civil service and faculty salaries in the form of a reduced raise, and on tuition in the form of a surcharge. Although SFC approved most aspects of the Management Committee's overall plan, members were critical of the decision to take all Twin Cities campus programmatic cuts from a total of only four colleges.

SFC also considered and advised on a number of other questions:

—Favored compensating faculty users on a one-year basis for the sudden drop in Blue Cross-Blue Shield outpatient mental health coverage, and recommended a deductible based on the actuarial value of new Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage added this year; however, administering that deductible was later determined to be impossible.

—Recommended a revised policy on the distribution of available indirect cost recovery funds. SFC discussed extensively with the President and Academic Vice President the overall structure of ICR distribution and the ends which the funds serve. After considering the different 1985 and 1986 Research Committee motions and the 1986 Educational Policy Committee motion, SFC endorsed the motion and amendment submitted to the Senate on May 15.

—Endorsed the University plan to fund tuition as a fringe benefit, paying for tuition for employees (except undergraduate employees) in degree programs through an increase in research grant and contract overhead. The University hereby becomes more competitive in its quest for talented graduate students by being able to provide fellowships to all graduate assistants.

—Supported to the Management Committee a Senate Library Committee resolution requesting an increase in the 1985-86 Twin Cities Campus Libraries acquisitions budget, seen as essential for the University to maintain parity in acquisitions with the four target institutions identified several years ago. The Management Committee reallocated the sum sought.

—Studied the "Summary of Retrenchment and Internal Reallocation for 1983-85" and discussed with the Academic Vice President the reasons for varying degrees of completion of the retrenchments.

—Considered salary issues. SFC agreed to a one-time 0.5% salary cut to protect programs (see above); otherwise SFC urged the adoption of salary strategies to make the University competitive with the top ranks of institutions, and supported the establishment of a task force to design a faculty development plan which would succeed the current policy on restoring faculty purchasing power.

—Discussed with the Assistant Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer the structure of research grant overhead.

—Discussed with Vice President Murthy what are the usual means of financing the establishment and maintenance of interdisciplinary programs, particularly those which cross college lines.

—Began consideration of the support and/or subsidy of child care for staff and students at the University and whether such an item should be included in the 1987-89 biennial request.

Members of the Committee are: Jack Merwin (chr.), John Adams, Gerald Bauer, Charles Campbell, Paul Gassman, Linda Hanson, William Hanson, Henricus Hogenkamp, Wendell Johnson (UMC), Sally Jorgenson, Gerald Klement, Kevin Koch, Ron Kubik (UMM), Frank Sorauf (alt.), W. Donald Spring, Patricia Thomas.

JACK MERWIN
Chair

IX. LIBRARY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86

A. Meetings:

To date the Senate Library Committee has met eight times this year, (October 11, November 8, December 13, February 21, April 3, April 14, and May 16), with a ninth and final meeting scheduled for June 9.

Member of the Committee met with members of the North Central Accreditation Association team during their on-site visit. The Chair of the Committee visited the Duluth Campus on May 9 to consult with faculty and library administrators concerning matters of concern to them.

B. Actions Taken:

The Senate Library Committee, working in cooperation with library administrators and University administrators, established Library Advisory Committees for the Humanities and Social Science Libraries and for the I.T. Libraries. These committees, composed of faculty and students from relevant units, are charged with consulting with library directors on problems and policies concerning the ongoing operation of these two libraries. The Senate Library Committee is kept informed of the deliberations of these committees by having one of its own members sit on each Library Advisory Committee.

The Senate Library Committee, particularly concerned that the 1985-86 Library Acquisitions budget did not contain funds adequate to cover costs due to current inflation in library materials, passed and forwarded a resolution to the Senate requesting that the University Administration redress this shortfall. Central administration responded by (a) providing funds for the current year, (b) giving a commitment of an eight percent inflation increase in the 1986-87 budget, and (c) providing assurances that library acquisition and operating budgets would not be subject to unallocation.

The Committee spent considerable time reviewing a series of preliminary and draft plans developed by task forces of library personnel concerning major (re)organization of University Libraries facilities and services, including plans regarding Government Publications, Acquisitions Funding, Reference Service, Library Instruction, Document Delivery, and Learning Resource Centers.

The Committee especially endorsed the Acquisitions Funding report in which steps are advocated to bring University of Minnesota libraries' acquisition funding more appropriately in line with that characteristic of peer institutions.

The Committee noted its approval of the attention to, and planning for, the services and facilities discussed in the other reports noted above. At its June 9 meeting, the Committee will consider more carefully the overall implications for resource allocation and funding priorities which arise as a result of the accumulated recommendations of these documents.

C. Items Noted:

The Committee received regular reports concerning the implementation of the plan for library automation, including the on-line catalogue, retrospective cataloguing of library holdings, and acquisition and implementation of software and hardware. The University Librarian reported that matters were progressing as close to the intended schedule as could be expected.

The Committee noted on several occasions, particularly concerning the matters of acquisition funding and University coordination of library automation, the difficulty of considering adequately the needs of the coordinate campus libraries.

D. Unfinished Business:

The Committee noted and registers its urgent concern that attention be given to the space needs of the University Libraries. Throughout the year the Committee was presented with evidence, as well as numerous individual complaints, which demonstrate convincingly (a) that collection growth can only be accommodated in the Wilson Library facility for about two more years, and (b) that circumstances of space and service in this and other facilities are such as to impede the teaching and research efforts of faculty and students. The Com-

mittee urges that planning begin immediately concerning the building of additional library facilities on the Minneapolis campus. The Committee also notes that funding for short term renovation and improvement of Wilson and Walter Libraries will be required and urges its approval with the highest priority. In the coming year, these issues will be a priority concern of the Senate Library Committee.

The Committee noted and registered its concern that appropriate steps be taken to provide adequate study space for students in campus facilities. Current library facilities, especially in Wilson and Walter Libraries, can not accommodate student study demand as well as the needs of faculty and students utilizing the library collections.

BRIAN JOB
Chair

X. RESEARCH COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86

In general, the Senate Research Committee has the responsibility for discussing and making comments on those aspects of University affairs which impinge either directly or indirectly on research at the University of Minnesota. Of necessity, this covers a very broad spectrum of topics. Patent policy, interactions with industry, Research Equipment, Inc., tuition scholarships for faculty, fringe benefit charges against grants, and strategic defense initiative research are only a few of the subjects which were discussed in depth during the 1985-1986 academic year.

With respect to tuition scholarships for graduate students, the Senate Research Committee recommended by unanimous vote that central administration seek complete funding for the current program for tuition scholarships from the legislature for the next biennium. This is to include teaching assistants, research assistants, and fellowship holders.

Extensive discussion was devoted to the subject of classified research on campus. The Senate Research Committee supported and reaffirmed the present University rules which forbid classified research on campus. A special meeting of the Senate Research Committee was held to discuss this subject as it applies to Research Equipment, Inc. (REI). As a result of this meeting, the Senate Research Committee passed a motion by unanimous vote which stated "The Senate Research Committee recommends to the President of the University of Minnesota that a formal statement be issued by Research Equipment, Inc. (REI) which reaffirms the existing policy that REI will not be involved in classified research nor will it process classified data. We recommend that REI explore ways of making sure that every contractor is aware of these restrictions." In response to the feelings of some members of the University community that members of the faculty should be restricted from accepting funds from certain agencies, the Senate Research Committee passed the following motion: "The University Senate Research Committee reaffirms the right of all members of the University research community to pursue any research which meets all of the requirements described in the University's *Sponsored Project Management—A Guide for Faculty and Staff*, published in July, 1980." In addition, the Senate Research Committee reaffirmed current University policy by stating that "In order to protect the right of academic freedom of University researchers to pursue the research of their choice and, at the same time, to guarantee the right of these same investigators to disseminate their scholarly findings, the University Senate Research Committee reaffirms the current regulations for the seeking of external support [stated in *Sponsored Project Management—A Guide for Faculty and Staff* (July, 1980, pages 30 and 31)], particularly as these regulations apply to classified research. In addition, we recommend that the University administration further clarify the interpretation of these regulations by stating that: (a) grants involving classified research will not be accepted at the University of Minnesota at any time without prior approval of the University Senate; (b) should research be classified after-the-fact, the University has the right to unilaterally cancel that part of the grant or contract involving the classified work; (c) academic freedom requires that University personnel should be unrestricted as to where their research is published and by whom or with whom this research is discussed; (d) the University will not accept federal grants or contracts which would restrict the employment of an individual based on race, creed, color, sex, or national origin." This motion was passed unanimously. Lastly, the Senate Research Committee discussed in detail the motion presented to the University Senate by a University senator in regard to Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) research. After careful review of the motion introduced into the Senate, a motion was introduced that "The Senate Research Committee finds the motion totally repugnant." This motion passed by a vote of 7-for, 1-against, 1-abstention.

Relative to indirect cost recovery distribution, the Senate Research Committee formulated a policy both in the 1984-1985 academic year and a revised one in the 1985-1986 academic year. Working with SCEP, a compromise between the two recommendations was achieved. This was submitted to various University Senate committees and eventually to the University Senate for a vote. This motion particularly takes into account a distribution on a proportionate basis of some indirect cost recovery funds directly to the colleges, departments, and principal investigators that generated these funds.

The Senate Research Committee reviewed the revised patent policy which was forwarded from a committee constituted to investigate this matter. After careful review, the Senate Research Committee recommended that this new patent policy be forwarded to the University Senate for approval.

The Senate Research Committee reviewed a new statement of "Guidelines on Interactions with Industry." Numerous changes in the original document were recommended and the Office of Research Administration and Technology Transfer accommodated these recommendations. This document has been forwarded to the University Senate for approval.

PAUL G. GASSMAN
Chair

XI. ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86

The All-University Honors Committee had an usually busy year, with meetings on October 9, November 6, and December 4, 1985, and February 26 and April 30, 1986. The committee approved nominations of alumni for four honorary doctor's degrees, including one Doctor of Arts and Letters and three Doctors of Science, seven Outstanding Achievement Awards, and two Alumni Service Awards. Responsibilities of the committee also include the naming of buildings and facilities. Thus, the committee approved the naming of a school, the renaming of a building (Mines and Metallurgy Building to become part of Arundson Hall), the naming of a hospital unit (the children's portion of Unit J to become the Variety Club Children's Hospital), and the renaming of the Variety Club Heart Hospital to the Variety Club Research Center to reflect a change of function, and the naming of four seminar and lecture rooms and a flower garden.

A question discussed repeatedly during the year arises from the perceived increasing number of honors and awards being bestowed at the college, institute, or departmental level. Since no comprehensive list of such honors and awards appears to exist, we have asked the Department of University Relations to try to provide one. We have been asked on several occasions during the year by the proposers whether review of honors and awards to be bestowed by a single college or institute falls under the jurisdiction of this committee. In general, the answer is probably no, but what about such honors or awards which may carry the implication that they are bestowed by the University as a whole? Shouldn't they fall under the jurisdiction of the All-University Honors Committee? Where should the line be drawn?

Composition of the committee during the year included 6 faculty members, 4 from the Minneapolis campus, 1 from St. Paul, and 1 from Morris; 3 students and 1 student alternate (who usually got a chance to vote because of the absence of one of the other three); 5 alumni members from the Twin Cities metropolitan area; 4 *ex officio* members representing Academic Affairs (the Vice President, represented by the Acting Assistant Vice President), Alumni Relations (the Director), Institutional Relations (the Vice President), and the University of Minnesota Foundation (Executive Director), and the secretary to the committee (from University Relations), who was invited to attend and take notes to assist the chair. Attendance was generally very good, especially from on-campus members; the busy schedules of the off-campus alumni members (who are much sought-after for their civic-mindedness) tended on the average to limit attendance on quite as regular a basis.

The committee notes that the diligence of the various academic units in nominating their outstanding alumni varies widely. In some units greater diligence is encouraged so that

their outstanding alumni will receive the recognition they deserve. Nominating procedures are described in the "Awards and Recognitions Policies and Procedures Handbook", June 1979, available from the Department of University Relations, 6 Morrill Hall.

WAYLAND E. NOLAND
Chair

XII. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT (15 minutes)

Questions shall be submitted in writing to the Clerk eight calendar days before the meeting. The Consultative Committee shall review them. Because a limited time is allotted to answering questions, it may be necessary for the committee to combine similar questions and to withhold others. The committee will also be guided by the breadth of interest in the issue. All questions received, together with the names of the questioners, shall be distributed at the meeting. The Consultative Committee shall group questions by general topics and shall indicate those which have been forwarded for answers. The person answering a question may, if he/she chooses, entertain additional questions from the floor which extend the original question.

XIII. OLD BUSINESS

XIV. NEW BUSINESS (15 minutes)

Please feel free to use this item to comment on a topic you believe is of general interest to the Senate. The Senate is reminded that this entry in the agenda (not to be confused with the Senate's "Questions to the President") may be used to raise specific issues, concerns and/or ideas of general interest. A motion is not required. As much as anything, the Business and Rules Committee wishes to remind the Senate that all ideas presented to the body need not flow from a committee.

XV. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS

JAMES L. THRELKELD
1919-1986

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE (immediately following the University Senate meeting)

The Senate constitution provides that all members of the faculty who hold regular appointment as defined in the *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure* may be present at Faculty Senate meetings and shall be entitled to speak and to offer motions for Faculty Senate action. Only elected faculty members (or their designated alternates) shall be entitled to vote.

I. COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE, 1986-87 Action (2 minutes)

This nomination is in addition to those approved at the May 15 meeting.
TENURE Students: Brian Kroeger, 1 to be named.

II. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Faculty Assembly approve the following resolution: Resolved, that the administration and the Faculty Consultative Committee jointly appoint a small committee of faculty and administrators to develop a plan for faculty development over the next decade, consistent with the University's commitment to focus and its stated goal of becoming one of the best five public universities in the country. This plan should address, possibly among other matters, (1) goals for faculty compensation, based on compensation at those schools with whom we compete for faculty and graduate students; (2) the proper size of the faculty; (3) support for faculty research and teaching, through the system of sabbatical leaves and other support; and (4) general working support—teaching loads, graduate assistants, etc. The goal of the committee should be to produce not a comprehensive report, but a brief set of specific goals which can guide our planning and our legislative requests.

COMMENT:

The objective of designing a broad plan for faculty development along the lines indicated in the above motion has the support of the Finance Committee and the Committee on Faculty Affairs as well as the Consultative Committee. President Keller has voiced his support for this kind of approach. The present Senate-endorsed Regents' policy on restoring faculty purchasing power has met with success at the state legislature and the improvement of average faculty salaries is slightly ahead of schedule. But there is widespread agreement that a more comprehensive plan for faculty support must succeed the current salary policy if this University is to become one of the country's top public universities. The work of the small committee proposed in the motion is intended to guide our planning and legislative requests over the next decade in all matters which relate to faculty support.

DEON STUTHMAN
Chair

III. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86 (2 minutes)

The Faculty Consultative Committee has made new efforts this year to respond to a faculty perception of too much "top-down" decision-making and insufficient faculty voice. The FCC met 19 times in addition to the 10 meetings of the full SCC; seven of the 19 meetings included discussions with President Keller. Communication with the administration was enhanced through the innovation of monthly meetings between the FCC chair and associate chair and the president and his senior assistant. Efforts undertaken jointly by the governance structure and central administration are identified in the SCC report.

In addition to the FCC/SCC chair's oral report to each Senate meeting, the committees communicated with other parts of the representational structure by sending meeting minutes to the chairs of 15 other committees of the Senate and to the chairs of 25 collegiate faculty consultative/faculty advisory/deans' advisory councils. The Faculty Consultative Committee urges faculty to communicate suggestions and concerns to the college and University representatives.

COMMITMENT TO FOCUS. C,F emerged last year as the primary comprehensive document against which significant decisions at all levels should be measured. C,F is itself a compilation of numerous earlier studies. FCC considered what was the proper role of the Senate with regard to C,F and concluded that recommendations with an impact on more than a single unit should be brought to the Senate, or the Assembly, as appropriate.

C,F: GENERAL COLLEGE. FCC in a written memorandum to the C,F Coordinating Committee, copied to the Board of Regents, supported President Keller's October 30 modified proposals for General College which took into account the report of the General College Task Group ("The General College Proposal for Change"). Before arriving at its position, FCC had a long interchange with General College representatives in which Deans Jeanne Lupton and Evelyn Hanson emphasized, among many other points, the need for integrating the General College into the rest of the University, and Professor Fred Amram presented arguments against eliminating the degrees and certificates. FCC wrote its support for the cessation of baccalaureate and associate degrees and of most certificate programs, for a General College concentration on the educational advancement of promising but underprepared students, and for a strong General College role in research activity focusing on the non-traditional student. FCC in fact recommended that General College be the home for a multi-disciplinary research center for higher education with emphasis on that student, a center which should involve the Graduate School and collaborations between GC faculty and faculty in the University's most relevant other units. At the request of President Keller and the FCC chair, FCC submitted a list of faculty names from which the president might select a number to constitute a study group on the proposed new center. FCC also recommended to the president that the center, when developed, be served by an ongoing advisory board.

C,F: PREPARATION REQUIREMENTS and COORDINATING TWIN CITIES LOWER DIVISION EDUCATION. FCC met with the chairs of each of the special committees and submitted responses to their interim reports. The Lower Division Committee's response to its complex assignment provoked numerous discussions; FCC's comments included requests for a clearer design for coordinating support services, for greater thoroughness and specificity generally, and for concentrating on the proposed Undergraduate Center. FCC studied the supplementary recommendations submitted by the Coordinating Committee to the Lower Division Committee.

FCC is deeply concerned that the multiplicity of support services for non-traditional students be coordinated and some of them integrated; FCC supports enhancing University activity in pre- and post-matriculation skills upgrading and advising to high potential minority students.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND ATTRACTING AND RETAINING A STRONG FACULTY. FCC discussed with the president and will bring to the Faculty Senate a motion (with the backing also of the Finance and Faculty Affairs Committees) for the establishment of a special Senate-administration task force to be charged with designing a broad faculty development plan which would succeed the current salary policy of restoring earlier purchasing power. FCC has discussed with the president present and anticipated support such as career development awards, endowed chairs, graduate tuition fellowships. FCC has discussed support for sabbaticals and single quarter leaves and whether the University discriminates adequately among faculty in its decisions on granting tenure.

FCC looked at recent AAUP salary data which show a decline of University salaries over the past two years from near the median among 31 peer institutions to well below the median.

OTHER FACULTY WELFARE ISSUES. The committee discussed with the president and other guests the implications for our faculty retirement system of portions of the tax reform bills before the United States Congress. Regarding supplementary outpatient mental health coverage for faculty affected on short notice by a change in Blue Cross-Blue Shield's plan, FCC kept itself informed and discussed the issues with the president but did not take an active role. The larger question of whether the University should change plans or try to alter the nature of its participation in the state plan has not been resolved.

ENDOWED CHAIRS. FCC heard reports from President Keller on numbers of requests for endowed chairs and their disposition.

FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISON. FCC is disappointed that the position of legislative liaison remained vacant during the 1986 session. In the fall of 1985 the committee recommended to the president several colleagues, one of whom he might request to assume the position; none of the people he asked found themselves able to accept the position at that time. Recently the FCC developed a second list which included some new names and submitted it for the president's consideration and action at the earliest possible date. FCC hopes a liaison can be identified early enough to become acquainted with the legislature well before the opening of the 1987 session which will make the biennial budget appropriations.

SUPPORT FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS. FCC devoted time to several meetings, including one with Graduate School Dean Robert Holt, and a second with several guest faculty members, to the subject of establishing and maintaining inter-collegiate graduate and research programs. Financing such programs without threatening collegiate and departmental budgets was a major concern; further primary questions are 1) choosing what to establish and when and how to let programs expire; 2) which faculty members to include; and 3) whether changes in the central decision-making structure are needed. The discussions brought home to FCC how seriously underfunded is the University.

ROLE IN MAJOR SEARCHES. FCC discussed with the president and with the search committee chair the search for an Academic Vice President and Provost, and the new scope in the job. FCC recommended to the president approximately 16 names from which the president appointed the 9 faculty members on the search committee.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE REGENTS. FCC met once each quarter with the Regents to discuss Commitment to Focus and the future of the University, especially as regards attracting and supporting the development of outstanding new faculty. An FCC observer attended most of the meetings of the Regents' committees. FCC discussed with the president possible forms of faculty representation on, or reporting to, certain of the Regents' committees, but no conclusion has yet been reached on a more participatory role.

ICRF DISTRIBUTION POLICY. FCC discussed with President Keller and Vice President Murthy the fixed costs, the distribution on a matching basis and for set-ups, and how best to enable research with these funds. After listening to arguments on many sides of the question, FCC negotiated the compromise May 15 Senate motion which recommends a change from the current Regents' policy.

LIBRARY ACQUISITIONS. The Committee discussed with the president and academic vice president the funds released last summer for several new positions to improve service, and the FCC expressed the faculty's deep concern about the delivery of services. In discussions with the vice president and with Senate Library Committee chair Brian Job, FCC gave its strong support for library funding sufficient to maintain acquisitions parity with the targeted comparison institutions. A prepared resolution to the Senate on this matter was withdrawn with the agreement of all participating committees when the Management Committee made the requested reallocation for 1985-86.

SEMESTER VS. QUARTERS: MANAGING THE QUESTION FOR THE ASSEMBLY. Because of the primacy of the educational policy aspect of the question, FCC asked that the Faculty Affairs Committee report the faculty survey findings to SCEP and asked that SCFA report its survey analysis to the Faculty Assembly and that both committees report their recommendations to the Campus Assembly.

PROMOTION AND TENURE ITEMS. FCC held a lengthy discussion with Tenure Committee chair Fred Morrison on the "Procedures for Reviewing the Performance of Probationary Faculty." In response to the Tenure Committee's separate question concerning outside reviews, FCC submitted its position that outside reviews have a clear value and the University should continue to require them. (Please see the SCC's annual report for progress on adopting revised grievance procedures.)

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY CONCERNS. FCC held quarterly meetings with the chair of the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women, Vera Schletzer, the EEO officer, Patricia Mullen, and Vice President and General Counsel Stephen Dunham concern-

ing petitions filed under the Rajender Consent Decree and other issues of concern to the EEOWC. Topics included the internal tribunals and a new academic staff assistance officer, part-time faculty appointments, especially as regards benefits and work expectations, effects on women of the establishment of the P/A classification, completing the database for salary comparisons, and specificity of standards for promotion and tenure decisions.

GRADUATION RATES. FCC received the report done for the president and the regents on graduation rates and has requested SCEP to put the issue on its 1986-87 agenda.

ATHLETICS TASK FORCE. The FCC chair was named to serve on this task force. FCC's associate chair made a statement on behalf of the FCC in the open hearing favoring accountability of coaches and athletics directors, calling for a unified and consistent academic standard, and requesting enhancement of the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics' capacity for faculty influence.

CIVIL SERVICE REPRESENTATION ON SENATE AND ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES. FCC discussed with Professor C. Arthur Williams the recommendations of his special committee (which SCC had created and charged). FCC, and later the full SCC, favored representation at least where the civil service employee class stands to be affected by decisions made or advice given. Following discussions with Committee on Committees chair Shirley Clark, Civil Service Committee chair Raleigh Karninsky, and the student members of SCC, the Consultative Committee and Committee on Committees brought motions to the May 15 Senate and Assembly meetings to add voting civil service membership on several committees where for the past three years there has been non-voting representation.

NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS. A regular subcommittee developed the lists of faculty names for FCC (and SCC where appropriate) to recommend or appoint to certain Senate and Assembly committees and several advisory bodies outside the Senate and Assembly structure. Richard Goldstein, Jack Merwin, Irwin Rubenstein, and Frank Sorauf comprised the nominating subcommittee.

THE P/A CLASS. FCC is preparing to create a task force as the Faculty Senate in June 1984, on approving the new tenure code, resolved to establish in 1986, to evaluate the P/A class with special attention to issues of academic freedom, effect on caliber of those hired into the class, fairness and appropriateness of evaluation standards, and appropriateness of each of the various categorizations. FCC intends to include representation from those most affected and for a balance of women and men on the task force close to what it is in the P/A category.

FACULTY ADVISORY GROUP TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD. At its May 29 meeting, the FCC was scheduled to discuss with Mr. David Jerde of the Inter-Faculty Organization a plan to constitute a Minnesota faculty body which would be advisory to the HECB. A student group for such a purpose already exists.

DEON D. STUTHMAN
Chair

IV. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86 (2 minutes)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I want to thank the members of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and others who served on SCFA subcommittees for their valuable contributions to the activities of this committee. In doing this I wish to call to the attention of the University community the contributions of these committee members, their dedication, good will, and much time and effort they devoted to the many tasks of this committee.

SCFA faculty members: James Berry (Neurology), Mark Brenner (Horticulture Science and Landscape Architecture), Charles Campbell (Physics), David Davis (Horticulture Science and Landscape Architecture), Margery Durham (English), Roland Guyotte (History, Morris campus), Royce Hansen (Public Affairs), Leonid Hurwicz (Economics), Harvey Keynes (Mathematics), Geoffrey Maruyama (Educational Psychology), Tim Nantell (School of Management), Takashi Okagaki (Obstetrics and Gynecology), Anne Pick (Child Development), Marian Pour-Ei (Mathematics), Paul Quie (Pediatrics), and Phillips Shively (Political Science); graduate student Eugene Ronning; non-SCFA subcommittee members Nick Barbatsis (Special Counseling Office), Richard Goldstein (Mechanical Engineering), Darwin Høndel (Educational Development Program), Stephen Scallen (Law), Leon A. Snyder (Genetics and Cell Biology), Zata Vickers (Food Science and Nutrition), Robert Vigeland (Accounting), and Arthur Walzer (Rhetoric); and actively contributing ex officio members Harold Bernard (Employee Benefits), Burton Paulu (Retirees Association), and Betty Robinett (Academic Affairs); and Marilee Ward (University Senate).

REPORT

By the end of the 1985-86 year the committee will have met 16 times for two hours or more each time. Substantial additional time was also contributed by members of the various subcommittees. Much of the activities and efforts of the committee were carried out by the subcommittees, but followed by discussions of the principal item by the committee as a whole. These discussions could be characterized as intense, serious, questioning, animated, and in good spirit. The committee was initially organized with six standing committees. A brief review of some of their activities will follow.

During the course of the year a special standing committee was organized to review the management of faculty retirement funds. This resulted in a total of seven standing committees. In addition, three ad hoc committees were formed to address specific short-term issues. Three members also served as representatives to other committees. In addition, a search committee was formed to select a person for the position of Academic Staff Assistance Officer.

Salary Issues Subcommittee

This subcommittee had many tasks, but most of their efforts were focused on development of a long-range faculty salary policy. As part of the development of this policy a review was conducted of present policy, the goal of which has been to restore faculty purchasing power equivalent to the 1972 level. This subcommittee has proposed to the Senate Consultative Committee and Senate Finance Committee that we develop a long-term faculty development plan that includes special attention to a) salaries, b) fringe benefits, c) sabbatical and single quarter leaves and re-training, and d) faculty-student ratios. This proposal would be consistent with the Commitment to Focus. The subcommittee also reviewed the policy of salary distribution.

SCFA, at the time of preparing this report (May 20), is preparing recommendations to the administration on salary monies for the budget for the next biennium. The recommendation for salary requests to the legislature will have three components:

- 1) an amount to continue the Regents' plan for salary recovery.
- 2) funding for anticipatory retention to assist in helping to work toward academic excellence and to avoid having to penalize "merely good" faculty by not taking funds from their normal raises to meet retention needs. SCFA has concerns about the present policy of requiring administrative units to provide the first 7.5% increase for anticipatory retention cases.
- 3) one year of the biennium amount to recover slippage in relation to our competitive institutions.

SCFA also notes that its traditional role of advising the administration on salary distribution was nearly by-passed this year. As a consequence, for the future, SCFA proposed that a calendar of process be developed in consultation with the Senate Consultative Committee, the administration, SCFA, and other appropriate Senate committees. (Maruyama, chr., Durham, Campbell, Hanson, Shively, Keynes, Ronning)

Economic Status of Retired Faculty Subcommittee

This subcommittee has been involved with an ongoing appraisal of the economic status of retired faculty members. Findings have shown that some retirees have been adversely affected by the ravages of inflation. Medical costs (health insurance) loom large as a threat to the economic well-being for this group. Two items of interest in this area were addressed by SCFA.

The first was a recommendation to the administration that a proposed retirement option plan to commence July 1, 1986, include University coverage of health insurance for retirees age 59 to 65. The second recommendation was also related to medical insurance coverage. SCFA endorses and supports a proposal by the administration to seek special legislative funding to cover medical insurance costs for all faculty retirees. This policy will be consistent with a number of Big 10 and other comparable institutions and is also consistent with the goal of making the University an attractive employer. (Davis, chr., Hurwicz, Paulu, Bernard, Robinett, Ronning)

Sabbatical and Single Quarter Leave Subcommittee

This subcommittee has reviewed the leave program and found that only a small percentage of the faculty take a sabbatical leave. A proposal for a revision of the sabbatical program is being developed, but has not been reviewed by the committee as a whole at the time of preparing this report. It is expected that a proposal will include retention of the present sabbatical program and that a pilot program to be established whereby various options of leave with full salary will also be proposed. This proposal will consider the role of the Bush funds to support sabbatical leave and additional special funds for faculty development. (Nantell, chr., Brenner, Guyotte, Pick)

Fringe Benefits Subcommittee

This subcommittee and SCFA as a committee of the whole were preoccupied (and devoted considerable time, effort, and debate) fall quarter with the abrupt change in out-patient care, largely as a consequence of the change in Blue Cross/Blue Shield coverage. It should be noted that University health care benefits are part of the State of Minnesota employees "package" and negotiated at the state level. Several meetings were devoted to this gap in coverage in an effort to alleviate the problems caused by the change. Eventually, nearly complete coverage was provided through a special funding effort by the administration. This was only a stop-gap effort. SCFA has continued to review the policy of the way in which health benefits are provided as part of the Minnesota state program. Liaison with the state has been initiated. This will be an on-going effort for the coming year.

Tuition remission for dependents of the faculty continues to be of interest, but did not receive sufficient attention this year in view of other competing items of fringe benefits. The implementation of a new policy by the administration to waive tuition for faculty members was welcomed. SCFA also supported the faculty mortgage program proposed by the administration to provide mortgage money to the faculty to purchase homes. (Brenner, chr., Hurwicz, Keynes, Shively, Bernard)

Legislative Request Liaison Subcommittee

This was a relatively new effort by SCFA this year to focus on the role and concerns of faculty members with respect to the legislature and legislative requests. The subcommittee initiated efforts to apprise SCFA members of the legislative process and procedures as they pertain to faculty issues such as compensation and fringe benefits.

The first session in this regard was a presentation and review of past legislative activities by Phil Shively, past U of M Faculty Liaison, and Pat Swan, President, UMF, on the issue of salary compensation. In this first session the importance of a modified long-range salary plan to ensure an adequate faculty compensation package from the legislature was stressed. SCFA discussed its role in modifying the current plan. A second session was with Vice President Stan Kessler, in which he reviewed his role with the legislature and possibly a more active role of SCFA. It is anticipated that similar sessions will be conducted in the fall of 1986 with recommendations coming from this subcommittee. (Keynes, chr., Campbell, Guyotte, Paulu, Shively)

Academic Calendar Survey Subcommittee

Last year SCFA proposed to the Senate that a survey of faculty members be made before a decision to change to a semester system be considered. That suggestion was accepted. This year SCFA was assigned the task of conducting the survey. A questionnaire was developed for the Twin Cities campus. The coordinate campuses were invited to participate and they did.

The survey was conducted starting in February and was finished at all campuses in early May. A total of 3,297 faculty members were polled, and 2,042 completed questionnaires were returned. This represented a return rate of about 62%, which the committee felt was very satisfactory. Two primary questions were addressed in the survey: system preference and preference to change to a semester system. The percentage of faculty members who preferred the quarter system was larger than that which preferred the semester system (49.4% vs. 36.6%). The results of the survey also showed that the majority of faculty *did not* prefer to change to a semester system from the quarter system (53.5% vs. 40.1%).

SCFA was also requested to make a recommendation on a change in the academic calendar to a semester system. SCFA made a recommendation after reviewing the results of the survey and after consultation with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. In view of the substantial number of faculty members who preferred the quarter system and voted against a change to the semester system, SCFA recommended continuation of the quarter system. Further, SCFA recommended that this policy be consistent in the University as now in practice. A detailed summary of results of the survey are presented elsewhere in this report. (Quie, chr., Pick, Robinett, Høndel)

Faculty Retirement Funds Subcommittee

This special subcommittee was formed at the end of winter quarter in response to concerns raised by several faculty members about the management and performance of investments of faculty retirement funds. This subcommittee has been reviewing the policy and management of the retirement funds. The subcommittee is expected to make specific recommendations regarding the management of funds and various aspects of faculty participation in the program. At the time of preparing this report the subcommittee had not completed its assignment. However, some points are now more clear.

It is expected that this subcommittee will recommend that a permanent subcommittee of SCFA be established to provide on-going review of faculty retirement funds. It is also expected that a recommendation will be made that a consultant (or consulting firm) be engaged to provide advice on matters of management and investment policy. The subcommittee is currently assessing management and investment options. It is expected that some changes in management of the investment funds will be implemented in the immediate future. Other changes and recommendations are expected to be developed in the coming year. SCFA acknowledges the assistance of Roger Paschke (Investments and Cash Management). (Scallen, chr., Goldstein, Snyder, Vigeland)

Academic Staff Assistance Officer Search Committee

This is a new position created as a consequence of the settlement of the Rajender case. SCFA has been designated as the administrative unit for the position. It will be a one-half time position for 18 months as agreed to by the administration and the petitioners. SCFA has named a search committee and will be accepting applications for the position (June 9 deadline) with the goal of filling the position by July 1, 1986. (Durham, chr., Barbatsis, Vickers)

William Boylan
Chair

V. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE STUDENT SENATE

(immediately following the Faculty Senate meeting)

I. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86

Beyond the steering role of the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), the Committee discussed a wide variety of issues.

In the fall, SSCC was instrumental in initiating the formation of the Special Senate Committee on Governance that has been examining the structure of University governance this year. Coinciding with the state legislative session, SSCC appointed the Student Lobby Advisory Committee (SLAC) and hired a lobbyist to work for SLAC's legislative agenda at the state level. In an effort to save money, the lobbyist was shared between SLAC and MSA. In another money-saving effort, the committee succeeded in moving the SSCC budget from the individual student associations to the President's Office.

A concern of the committee throughout the year has been the implementation of Commitment to Focus and the various reports of the Task Forces appointed to study it. SSCC met with the chair of the Task Force on a Unified Lower Division and the chair of the Task Force on Increased Preparation Standards to discuss our concerns with them. SSCC discussed and responded to the various proposals regarding the General College and presented its concerns and suggestions to the administration and the Regents.

In a move to give the student body presidents of the various campuses a formal link to University governance, an amendment to the Senate constitution was introduced by the SSCC to make the student body presidents ex officio members of the Senate.

The committee discussed the issues of athletics and education and presented testimony to the Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics.

SSCC met with the student chair of Committee on Committees to discuss recruitment of students, especially in the context of improving recruitment on the coordinate campuses.

The committee met with Gretchen Kreuter, Assistant to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, to discuss our concerns regarding teaching assistants and teaching assistant training programs being developed by the administration. SSCC has supported MSA and the administration's efforts in this area.

The Committee is currently working on an amendment to the Senate constitution that would result in the recognition of deceased students at Senate meetings. SSCC has also been discussing a proposal from the Student Academic Support Services to reinstitute the F grade on the Twin Cities campus.

Roy T. St. Laurent
Chair

II. STUDENT LOBBYING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86

The 1986 legislative session was a tough one for most Minnesotans and University students were no exception. SLAC's number one item on their legislative agenda was funding for part-time students. We were able to retain the full level of funding for the campus based part-time grant program for 1986. However, the implementation of the 1/5 million dollar four-year academic equivalency program was delayed for one year. Also high on the SLAC agenda was fighting the 21-year old drinking age bill which passed into law by a slim 4 vote margin.

SLAC met 3 times this winter and each of the meetings was a productive planning session.

TIM PRATT
Senator

III. ADJOURNMENT

UNIVERSITY SENATE FORUM

Thursday, April 18, 1985

2:15 p.m.

*April 1985
Report of
Working Committee*

25 Law Center—Twin Cities Campus
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus
502 Darland Adm. Bldg.—Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus
Learning Resources Center Conference Room—Waseca Campus

MATERIAL FOR DISCUSSION

The following material was prepared by the Semester Working Group consisting of Betty Robinett (chair), John Imholte, Russell Hobbie, Sam Lewis, Cherie Perlmutter, Craig Swan, William Weiler, Keith Wharton, Dorothy Abts (ex officio), and DeeAnn Olsen (staff).

A. WHAT WAS THE SEMESTER WORKING GROUP'S ASSIGNMENT?

One of the suggestions made by the Task Force on the Student Experience, as part of a general recommendation to initiate studies to identify the most effective learning strategies for lower division students, was to "consider implementing the semester system." In response to this suggestion the Semester Working Group was appointed and asked to prepare a plan for a possible transition to the semester system should the decision be made to undertake such a change. With this as their charge, the committee has been gathering information from within the institution, as well as from other institutions that have recently made such a change, to ascertain exactly what would be involved in moving from the quarter to the semester system. The materials presented here represent what the Working Group has been able to identify as major issues to be addressed in deciding whether or not a transition to the semester system is advisable. It is hoped that this information will provide a basis for enlightened discussion.

The original charge was for the development of a plan for the Twin Cities campus, allowing the other campuses to join if they so chose. However, it is the feeling of the Working Group that if a conversion were to occur on the Twin Cities campus it would be to the advantage of the University if the other two four-year campuses (Duluth and Morris) also converted. The special missions of the Crookston and Waseca campuses might argue for a different calendar.

Certain external constraints were discovered that limit flexibility in offering alternative plans. For example, the presence of the State Fair adjacent to the St. Paul campus through Labor Day effectively precludes any possibility of beginning the semester before Labor Day. Thus, we looked most seriously at calendars that satisfied these constraints.

The conversion should not be looked upon as a means of changing either the faculty or student workload. Rather, such a change should enhance the learning environment for the student and the working environment for the faculty.

After reviewing information from other institutions and in discussions within our own institution, the Working Group came to accept the following principles: Any semester calendar

- should not increase demands upon students nor increase student workloads;
- should not impede the academic progress of currently enrolled students during the transition period;
- should not increase faculty workloads;
- should not diminish research and scholarship opportunities for faculty;
- should not have implications for faculty salaries;
- should be implemented only after allotting adequate time to make the conversion sensibly;
- should be designed to accommodate a very real need not to begin classes before Labor Day and also to provide a first term ending prior to the December holidays;
- should not diminish educational services provided by the University to the State of Minnesota.

Other institutions that have gone through this process recently (including UCLA, which is currently contemplating such a change) comment on the opportunity such a change provides for careful assessment of the educational enterprise in their institutions. The following statement from the material distributed for discussion at UCLA seems worthy of consideration in our own institution:

At Berkeley, administrators and faculty members maintain that, apart from the eventual outcome, the consideration of calendar change was a healthy, stimulating, if difficult experience that brought under examination a wide range of critical educational issues. Large institutions, like individuals, benefit from occasional intensive exercises in self-examination. A recent major report, "Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education" by a study group of the National Institute of Education, found that colleges and universities are excessively settled in their habits and generally negligent in assessing the effectiveness of their institutional programs. The criticism is one that should be taken to heart at UCLA. Because the academic calendar stands at the center of how we function as a teaching and research institution, perhaps this is where the process of self-examination should begin.

B. WHAT WOULD A SEMESTER BE LIKE?

Alternative Semester Calendars

In selecting alternative semester calendars for discussion, one of the overriding concerns was to avoid a semester that would be split by the December holidays. This concern necessitated a beginning in late August if a 45-minute class period was to be continued. However, if the class period was lengthened to a 50-minute period, we could begin immediately after Labor Day and end before the holidays. Because of the presence of the State Fair adjacent to the St. Paul campus until Labor Day, it seems essential that any proposed calendar for the Twin Cities commence after Labor Day.

Attached are two alternative semester calendars, each with a 14-week semester. Since both models provide a longer break between semesters than we now have between quarters, five working days could be allowed to turn in grades after examinations.

The first model is based on the calendar that has been used at the University of Michigan for several years. It utilizes 50-minute periods and it provides for an early start in the fall but not until after Labor Day. The second semester begins shortly after the first of the year and ends very early. The second semester is followed by two seven-week summer terms to accommodate two types of students: those interested in the early summer term are generally regular year students, while those in the second summer terms are the kinds of students who often attend summer school, often from the public schools.

The second model, also with a 14-week term and 50-minute class periods, differs from the first only in that it provides for a longer break between semesters. The spring semester starts in mid or late January and ends in May. The summer could be composed of terms of varying lengths to accommodate the needs of particular programs.

We have also attached alternative daily class schedules illustrating 50-minute class periods throughout the day starting at 8:00 a.m. and at 8:15 a.m. Another item of information in this section is a table that shows comparative class contact time under the quarter and semester systems.

Model 1 (14 week—50-minute class periods)

FALL TERM, 1984

Classes begin	September 6
Classes end	December 12
Study day	December 13
Exams	December 14—15, 17—20

WINTER TERM, 1985

Classes begin	January 9
Spring Break	7th week (February 18—23)
Classes end	April 24
Study days	April 25, 27, 28
Exams	April 26, April 29—May 3

SPRING—SUMMER TERM, 1985

Classes begin—Spring half term	May 8
Classes end—Spring half term	June 25
Study day	June 26
Exams	June 27—28
Classes begin—Summer half term	July 3
Classes end—Summer half term	August 20
Study day	August 21
Exams	August 22—23

Model 2

(14 week—50-minute class periods)

FALL SEMESTER, 1984

Classes begin	September 6
Classes end	December 12
Study day	December 13
Exams	December 14—15, 17—20

SPRING SEMESTER, 1985

Classes begin	January 21
Mid Semester Break	March 11—16
Classes end	May 3
Study day	May 4
Exams	May 6—11

Alternative Daily Schedules 15 Minutes Between Classes

50-Minute Classes—MWF

	A	B
I	8:00—8:50	8:15—9:05
II	9:05—9:55	9:20—10:10
III	10:10—11:00	10:25—11:15
IV	11:15—12:05	11:30—12:20
V	12:20—1:10	12:35—1:25
VI	1:25—2:15	1:40—2:30
VII	2:30—3:20	2:45—3:35
VIII	3:35—4:25	3:50—4:40

75-Minute Classes—TTh

	X	Y
I	8:00—9:15	8:15—9:30
II	9:30—10:45	9:45—11:00
III	11:00—12:15	11:15—12:30
IV	12:30—1:45	12:45—2:00
V	2:00—3:15	2:15—3:30
VI	3:30—4:45	3:45—5:00

Quarter—Semester Contact Time

	Class Period	Number of Meetings	Contact Time (by term)	Contact Time (by year)
<i>Monday—Wednesday—Friday</i>				
10-week quarter	45	30	1350	4050
14-week semester	50	42	2100	4200
<i>Tuesday—Thursday</i>				
10-week quarter	75	20	1500	4500
14-week semester	75	28	2100	4200

Faculty Workload

It is important that across the University the conversion to the semester system have as minor an impact as possible on instructional workload and research opportunities. A systematic reduction in instructional workload could easily lead to a reduction in state funding and would be unfair to students. Any systematic increase in instructional workload could have an adverse impact on faculty research opportunities.

While classroom instruction is only part of the total instructional effort, there is much concern about the implications of a possible change to the semester system on faculty course loads. If one defines an individual faculty member's classroom instruction responsibilities in terms of contact time and maintains the same contact time over the year whether the University is on the quarter or semester system, then there need not be any change in this element of instructional workload. With no change in contact time over the year, it may be unclear what the implication for an individual faculty member's course load would be under the semester system. **If all semester courses meet for 50 percent more time than their quarterly counterparts, course loads could be defined by requiring the same number of courses over three semesters as are currently required over three quarters.** This adjustment of course loads is consistent with the constraint of no change in contact time as seen below. If the conversion to the semester system includes a change to a 50-minute class period, there may actually be a small increase in classroom contact time.

Course Load (3 qtrs)	Contact Time (3 qtrs)	Annual Contact Time	Course Load (3 smstrs)	Contact Time (3 smstrs)	Annual Contact Time (2 smstrs)
4	90 hrs	90 hrs	4	140 hrs	93 1/3 hrs
5	112.5 hrs	112.5 hrs	5	175 hrs	116 2/3 hrs
6	135 hrs	135 hrs	6	210 hrs	140 hrs

(10-week quarter) (30 meetings of 45 minutes) (14-week semester) (42 meetings of 50 minutes)

Teaching loads vary from unit to unit for a variety of reasons including different missions and differences in research funding. A decision to require all units to maintain the same course loads over three semesters instead of three quarters would preserve the present autonomy of units in terms of setting course loads.

Implications for average class size are examined below. The table shows that for a faculty member supplying the same amount of contact time and with semester courses

meeting for 50 percent more time and carrying 50 percent more credit than quarter courses, then, for the same sized student body enrolling for the same amount of instruction, there need be no change in average class size. The table is an illustration based on a six-course teaching load under the quarter system. A different teaching load would not change any fundamental result.

Quarter/Semester Conversion

	Current Quarter System	Semester System
1. # FTE students	12,000	12,000
2. # faculty	500	500
3. # credits/course	4	4
4. # weekly meetings/course	3	3
5. # courses/faculty	6	4
6. # courses FTE student/year	12	8
7. # units FTE students/year	48	32
8. # units to degree	180	120
9. # courses to degree	45	30
10. # units/faculty/year	24	16
11. # sections/year	3,000	2,000
12. # Average class size	48	48
13. # Contact hours/faculty/year	135*	140**
14. # Contact hours to degree	1,012.5*	1,050**

*Q=22.5 hrs **S=35 hrs

Notes:

- Conversion to semesters is assumed to have no impact on the number of students or faculty.
- Interrelations indicate that not all items can be set independently. For example, if items 3, 4, 5 and 8 are set by policy considerations and item 6 determined by student behavior, then everything else follows arithmetically.

There is concern that the semester system will offer less flexibility in terms of scheduling time for research activities. The quarter system appears to offer a number of advantages. Concerns include the following:

- Many are concerned that a change to the semester system will jeopardize the University's current program for fully funded Faculty Single Quarter Leaves. The Semester Working Group strongly recommends the establishment of a comparable program for single semester leaves. A single semester leave does withdraw half of an individual's annual contribution to a department's teaching mission. This cost of a single semester leave program is likely to be especially severe in small units. Supplementary resources may be necessary in these cases.
- Concerns have been raised by faculty in departments where arrangements have been made for a quarter free from classroom teaching (not advising, committee assignments, or other responsibilities) by assuming heavier teaching loads in other quarters. They wonder if similar arrangements would be possible under the semester system. If current faculty course loads, measured over three quarters, are converted to the same number of semester courses over three semesters, similar arrangements would be possible by scheduling heavier teaching loads during certain semesters.
- Beyond internal flexibility, many faculty members arrange for a quarter off from teaching by buying off time through research grants or taking a single quarter leave without pay to pursue research and/or teaching opportunities away from the University. In these cases a department loses only one third of a colleague's contribution to the curriculum and an individual need find funding for only one third of her or his annual salary. Under the semester system leaves-without-pay would absent a faculty member for one half of a year. Complete elimination of teaching responsibilities for a semester would require one half a year's salary rather than one third. While one can imagine buying off one third of one's teaching obligations, the necessary bookkeeping under the semester system may be more cumbersome than under the quarter system.
- It has been argued that it is easier to respond to new research opportunities within a year under the quarter system. The argument is the same as above, that in terms of course scheduling or buying off time, it is easier to make the necessary adjustments and free up one third of a year than it would be to free up one half of a year.

Student Concerns Regarding Semester Conversion

Most students currently attending the University of Minnesota probably have not attended school under the semester system unless they transferred in from a private school or from out of state. We have been informed that the student body has been polled recently to assess their opinion on the possible change, but we have not yet been informed of the results.

Tuition Assessment and Financial Aid

Under the semester system total tuition and fee payments for a year would be the same as under the quarter system. The payment for an individual semester would be 50 percent larger than for a quarter. This fact worries some students. There is no doubt that accumulating the necessary funds could be difficult, particularly for those part-time students not eligible for student financial aid or help from other sources. On the other hand, 50 percent of the Twin Cities campus student body is eligible for student aid to help pay expenses. Student aid is awarded based on expenditures for the academic year. While annual student awards would remain unchanged, quarterly allocations would be augmented by 50 percent to cover the longer semester time periods and the larger tuition. Students should not encounter any greater difficulty paying for tuition and fees. On the other campuses up to 80 percent of the students are eligible for aid. The semester system would likely make it financially easier for all students eligible for aid since they would only need to make arrangements twice rather than three times a year to pick up their financial assistance. Graduate students often have their tuition and fees paid through payroll deduction or student aid and should not have major difficulties paying the larger sum.

All day school students are eligible to participate in an installment payment plan for tuition and fees. Under the semester system the installment plan could be expanded to three payments rather than the current two. This would allow payment to be spread out enough so that students and parents would not have a more significant problem with cash flow.

The majority of CEE students pay their own way and may have problems gathering together the money to pay tuition. To alleviate this problem, consideration should be given to an installment payment plan for CEE students. CEE students now must pay when they register. Approximately 20 percent of CEE students receive direct tuition reimbursement from their employers. Additional students are funded by student aid or veteran benefits. These latter two groups of students would not be significantly affected by having to pay a larger tuition bill.

Stop-in/Stop-out

These phrases have become common to describe postsecondary educational attendance patterns in recent years. The average undergraduate student now enrolls for about 12 credits per term. Once quarters out of school and courses not successfully completed are considered, it takes about six years for the average student to earn an undergraduate degree. Under a semester system the stop-in/stop-out phenomenon would be inhibited by the longer length of the term. Some student attendance patterns are quite irregular and may relate to the need to accumulate the necessary finances to pay tuition—in one quarter, out one quarter, in one quarter... This pattern is most prevalent among part time, adult special, and evening school students. Evening school students usually work full time during the day. They may find it more difficult to make the special commitment to continuing education if it involves 14 weeks rather than 10.

Student Employment

Each quarter 70–75 percent of the student body is employed. During the course of an academic year the percentage of employed students is even higher. Many students attempt to organize their academic schedules in patterns that will make it easy for them to fit in their work hours. Schedules that have all classes in the morning or afternoon, or on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, are not uncommon. Students will be worried about the semester system if it inhibits their ability to work. If the semester system does not significantly increase the number of hours per week they must be in class, then problems with working hours will be minimized.

University Access

The semester system will eliminate the possibility of starting school in spring quarter. In spring 1984, 1,328 new students began attending the five campuses of the University. Only 339 of these students were new high school students (those who have never previously attended a post-secondary institution). All the rest were transfer students from other educational institutions. In fall quarter 1983 there were 14,131 new students of whom 8,151 were new high school students and in winter 1984 there were 2,243 new students and 691 new high school students. The percentage of new students who started in spring is 7.5 percent of the fall-winter-spring total. The percentage of new high school students who started in spring is 3.7 percent of the fall-winter-spring total. These low percentages indicate that not many students wish to begin their University careers in spring quarter. If the University were on the semester system, it is possible that other state public systems of higher education would also switch to semesters. In that case the lack of access to spring quarter would be even less important.

In regard to Summer Session, it will be important to provide flexibility so that prospective students have access to multiple starting dates.

Transcripts

Student transcripts would have to identify clearly the date the University converted to semesters. Student cumulative credit calculations would have to be converted from quarter to semester equivalencies. See pages 12–14 for examples of how transcripts could be modified to inform students and others about the conversion to semesters.

Students could be adversely affected by changes in academic program requirements, elimination or recombination of courses, and the general academic conversion in such a way that their graduation date could be delayed. This possibility could be eliminated by allowing students to graduate under the requirements for their major or program that were listed in a previous or new catalog. Degree program advisors and faculty could be requested to be flexible with the requirements so students caught in the conversion would not be unfairly disadvantaged. There should be a broad-based information campaign to inform students and allay their fears regarding credit conversions.

Advising

Special emphasis should be given to the improvement of the advising process under the semester system. Advising is a major concern of students at the University. The large number of recommendations in the report of the Task Force on the Student Experience is evidence of this concern. On the face of it students would not have to have as many advising contacts under the semester system. This would save students and advisors time. Students would feel the need for good advising more strongly under the semester system, however, since it is more important that they be enrolled in the correct mix of courses than it is under the quarter system. Careful student program planning will be needed. Current advising systems rely in large measure on the registration system to enforce advising contacts between students, faculty, and college offices. Extensive thought should be given to the whole issue of assisting students to make sure that they have developed a good academic plan for themselves. Uninformed course selection decisions would commit students to longer periods of instruction, which may be counterproductive to the completion of their academic programs.

Minnesota's Climate

Minnesota springs often may not get completely under way until May 1. If a spring semester were to end by early May, activities that rely on warm weather would be severely restricted. Courses in agriculture, biology, geology, horticulture, studio art, and other subjects that rely on outdoor activity would be limited. Recreational activities would be similarly disadvantaged more than they are in semester schools in warmer climates.

Administrative Operations

Students can find functions such as registration, tuition payment, and financial aid check disbursement time-consuming and frustrating if they are not well organized. Bureaucratic procedures can be a definite headache. While conversion to the semester system will not in and of itself help eliminate such procedures, students will only need to complete two such periods per academic year.

SAMPLE

MAILING
ADDRESS
BIRTH

DEPT	COURSE NUMBER	DESCRIPTIVE TITLE	QTR CR	GRADE
FROM UNIV OF MINN-EXTENSION				
			FALL	1983
GEOG	3331	INTRO TO ECON	F83 4.0	TC
4.0	CR	2.00 QTR GPA	2.00	CUM GPA
UM-CLA PRE BUS				
			FALL	1983
MATH	0009	INTERMED ALGEBRA	.0	N
POL	1025	WORLD POLITICS	4.0	B
4.0	CR	3.00 QTR GPA	2.50	CUM GPA
UM-CLA PRE BUS				
			WTR	1984
AST	1011	DESCRIPTIVE AST	4.0	C
AST	1015	DESCRIPTIVE AST LAB	1.0	N
MATH	1111	COLL ALG, ANALY GEOM	5.0	C
PE	1415	WEIGHT TRAIN, CONDIT	2.0	A
PSY	1001	INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY	5.0	C
16.0	CR	2.25 QTR GPA	2.33	CUM GPA
UM-CLA PRE BUS				
			SPR	1984
BIOL	1101	HEREDITY, HUM SOC	4.0	C
COMP	1011	WRITING PRACTICE I	5.0	A
MUS	1001	FUNDAM OF MUSIC	4.0	B
13.0	CR	3.08 QTR GPA	2.59	CUM GPA
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA QUARTER TOTALS				
37.0 GPA CREDITS		96.0 GPA GRADE PTS		
37.0 TOTAL CREDITS		2.59 CUM GPA		

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA CHANGED TO
SEMESTER CREDITS FALL, 1984

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA SEMESTER TOTALS

24.7 GPA CREDITS 64.0 GRADE PTS
24.7 TOTAL CREDITS 2.59 CUM GPA

UM-CLA	PRE BUS	FALL 1984
ECON	1001 PRINS OF MACROECON	4.0
ENGL	3251 KING JAMES BIBLE	4.0
GEOG	1973 GEOG OF TWIN CITIES	4.0

END OF RECORD

FROM BLACK DUCK STATE UNIV SPR 1984

ARTS	110 CALLIGRAPHY	1.0 TB
ENGL	110 FRESHMAN COMPOSIT I	2.5 TB
ENGL	115 FRESHMAN COMPOSIT 2	2.5 TB
GEO	101 INTRO GEOLOGY	2.5 TA
HIST	120 WESTERN CIV TO 1500	2.5 TA
MATH	215 COLLEGE ALGEBRA	2.5 TB
MUS	109 INTRO TO MUSIC	2.5 TA
MUS	120 INTRO TO MUSIC THEORY	2.5 TA
MUS	242 ORCHESTRA	2.0 TA
MUS	261 PIANO LESSON	1.0 TC
MUS	264 WOODWIND LESSON	2.5 TB
PHIL	202 SYMBOLIC LOGIC	2.5 TC
PHIL	210 CLASSICAL PHILOSOPH	2.5 TB
PSY	210 GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY	2.5 TB
SPCH	118 INTRO SPCH COMM	2.5 TA
TH	141 ORAL INTERPRETATION	2.5 TA

36.5 SEMESTER CR TRANSFERRED

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA CHANGED TO
SEMESTER CREDITS FALL, 1984

UM-CLA	THEAT ARTS	FALL 1984
HIST	3623 REFORMATION-GERMANY	4.0
SPCH	1110 FR DISCUSS,DEBATE	2.0
TH	1101 INTRO TO THEATRE	4.0
TH	1504 ELEMENTS OF TECH TH	4.0
TH	5110 TH PERFORMANCE	1.0

END OF RECORD

FROM WEST RAMSEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE SPR 1984

CSCI	101 PASCAL	4.0 TB
CSCI	111 COMPUTER,SOC	4.0 TB
CSCI	202 FORTRAN PROG	4.0 TA
CSCI	203 COBOL PROG	4.0 TA
CSCI	250 ASSEMBLY LANG	4.0 TA
ECON	106 PRIN ECON MACRO	4.0 TB
ENGL	111 FRESH ENGLISH 1	5.0 TB
ENGL	112 FRESH ENGLISH 2	5.0 TA
HIST	180 HIST MINNESOTA	3.0 TA
MATH	115 COLLEGE ALGEBRA	5.0 TC
MATH	121 CALC 1	5.0 TB
MATH	122 CALC 2	5.0 TB
MATH	123 CALC 3	5.0 TC
MATH	231 CALC 4	5.0 TC
MATH	232 LINEAR ALGEBRA	5.0 TC
MUS	116 BAND	4.0 TA
MUS	117 BAND 2	1.0 TA
MUS	122 MUSIC APPRECIATION	5.0 TA
PHYS	121 GEN PHYSICS 1	4.0 TC
PHYS	122 GEN PHYSICS 2	4.0 TB
PHYS	124 GEN PHYSICS 1 LAB	1.0 TA
PHYS	124 GEN PHYSICS 3	4.0 TC
PHYS	125 GEN PHYSICS 2-LAB	1.0 TA
PHYS	126 LAB	1.0 TA
PSY	201 GEN PSYCHOLOGY 1	3.0 TB
SOC	101 INTRO SOC	4.0 TC
STAT	113 ELEM STAT	5.0 TB

104.0 CR TRANS

UM-CLA PRE CP SCI FALL 1983

CSCI	3104X INTRO-PROG,PROB SOL	3.0 C
CSCI	3105 FUNDAM:ALGOR,LANG I	4.0 C
GEOG	3101 GEOG OF U.S. CANADA	4.0 C
MUS	1021 INTRODUCTION:MUSIC	5.0 S

16.0 CR 2.00 QTR GPA 2.00 CUM CPA

UM-CLA	PRE CP SCI	WTR 1984
CSCI	3106 FUNDAM:ALGOR,LANG 2	4.0 A
CSCI	3400 DISCRETE STRUCTURES	4.0 B
SOC	3671 COMPAR RURAL SOCIET	4.0 A

12.0 CR 3.67 QTR GPA 2.87 CUM GPA

UM-CLA COMPUT SCI SPR 1984

SPAN	1101 BGN SPAN:ORAL APPRO	5.0 S
------	--------------------------	-------

5.0 CR 0.00 QTR GPA 2.87 CUM GPA

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA QUARTER TOTALS

23.0 GPA CREDITS 66.0 GPA GRADE PTS
33.0 TOTAL CREDITS 2.87 CUM GPA
104.0 CREDITS TRANSFERRED

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA CHANGED TO
SEMESTER CREDITS FALL, 1984

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA SEMESTER TOTALS

15.4 GPA CREDITS 44 GPA GRADE PTS
22.0 TOTAL CREDITS 2.87 CUM GPA
69.7 CREDITS TRANSFERRED

UM-CLA COMPUT SCI FALL 1984

CSCI	3107 INTRO:STRUCT,PROGRA	4.0
CSCI	5121 INTRO:DATA STRUCT	4.0
SPAN	1102 BGN SPAN:ORAL APPRO	5.0
STAT	3091 PROBABILITY,STAT	.0 W
STAT	3091 PROBABILITY,STAT	4.0 W

END OF RECORD

SAMPLE

C. WHAT WOULD BE INVOLVED IN IMPLEMENTING A SEMESTER SYSTEM?

Notes on Curriculum Conversion

Conversion from a quarter-based curriculum to a semester-based curriculum has followed a number of models. Some of these include:

Model A: Adjusting the pace so that existing courses are taught over 14 weeks instead of 10 weeks. For example, single-quarter courses that meet three times a week for 10 weeks could meet twice a week for 14 weeks. Two-quarter sequences that meet three times a week for a total of 20 weeks could meet four times a week for 14 weeks.

Model B: Adopting a standard course module for the majority of courses and converting courses to semester courses by the addition of 50 percent more material. Note that this adjustment is unnecessary for year-long sequences and implies that all other one- and two-quarter courses would be expanded to one and two semesters. If all courses were offered regularly, this model implies a substantial increase in faculty teaching loads. It is also unclear whether there would be enough classrooms to handle the increased number of courses per term.

Model C: Adopting a standard course module and converting department curricula to semester offerings subject to some sort of two-thirds constraint on the number of courses and/or offerings. This adjustment is straightforward for year-long sequences and implies that units must restructure other course offerings. For example, three separate courses that covered the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries could be offered in two semesters that covered the 17th and first half of the 18th century in the first semester and the second half of the 18th and 19th centuries in the second semester.

Model D: Another possibility would call for a more fundamental change in the University's whole curriculum. For instance, one might stop measuring courses in terms of credits and instead measure all offerings in terms of "courses." A full load might be four courses and all courses would be expected to require an equivalent measure of work. Under this scheme, graduation requirements would be defined in terms of courses rather than credits.

Colleges and departments must address a number of issues when thinking of curriculum conversion, including decisions about course modules, collegiate distribution requirements, major requirements, department-specific course offerings, student course loads, faculty workloads, course availability, and room scheduling capacity.

Course Module, Distribution and Major Requirements

Decisions about unit credit and contact hours reflect basic concerns about breadth and depth and have direct implications for student course loads and faculty workloads. Three-credit course modules imply a full-time student course load of five courses a semester and 40 courses for graduation. Four-credit modules imply four courses a semester and 30 courses to graduate.

Many faculty share the concerns of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) that important elements of educational policy may be at risk during a conversion to the semester system. SCEP has raised particular concerns about the following areas:

- Possible damage to the liberal education requirements of undergraduate programs;
- A loss of elective opportunities for students as against major and distribution requirements;
- Reduced opportunity for faculty to teach specialized courses reflecting their research and intellectual interests;
- A proliferation of one- and two-credit courses that would undercut the semester system's opportunity for greater depth and encourage or even require students to register for an excessive number of courses in order to maintain appropriate degree progress.

Decisions about distribution and major requirements reflect difficult choices about areas of inquiry and knowledge that should form a common core of any undergraduate degree and the recognized need to allow students the opportunity to explore other areas of special interest and competence, including the concentration of effort appropriate to a major. Should the University move to a semester system, consideration of the structure of new requirements might start with the presumption of a two-thirds adjustment of distribution and major requirements to preserve their relative importance. As the faculty consider specific requirements, they will need to examine the resource implications of decisions to deviate from a two-thirds adjustment in light of the points listed above.

and costs involved. Most forms will need to be scrapped and recreated. Some of the programs that would need revision include:

- Official University and HEGIS statistical report programs
- First Day and Second Week Class Lists
- Student Rosters
- Major Advisor Lists and Reports
- Grade Reports
- Grade Slips
- Numerous Registration Programs and Reports
- Registration Status Notices
- Transcripts (Official and Operational)
- Course Inventory Reports used by MPIS and Colleges
- Degree Programs and Lists

Registration, Student Records, and Scheduling is also responsible for the quarterly Class Schedule. It would need rewriting and revision. Whether only needing two schedules per year would save would depend on the number of courses and sections that would have to be incorporated in the publication. Editing costs would eventually be lower.

Information Systems and Services. This department is a service department for the three operational departments listed above in Student Support Services and would be involved deeply in the changes listed above. ISS is also responsible for coordinating new computer developments. There are a number of ongoing developments that will be in the process of being programmed and implemented in the next few years. Some of the major ones are the following:

- A New Admissions and Prospective Student System
- An Extension Student Data Base, Extension Student Registration System, Conversion of Extension Student Payment Processing to SAR
- Final Automation of the Student Financial Aid System
- A Revision of the Course Inventory System
- The Likely Development of an Automated Degree Progress and Graduation Clearance System

The change to semesters might stall the development of many of these systems since it will require Administrative Data Processing to spend time revising current production programs. Developments could be delayed the better part of two years. The degree of delay will depend on whether program changes required by the conversion to semester will be phased in or whether they must all be completed prior to implementation.

ISS is also responsible for college bulletins. In the long run there could be savings in bulletins if there are fewer courses overall.

Continuing Education and Extension. There would be no likely savings. CEE courses are already under both the quarter and semester system. No major system changes would seem necessary apart from course revision. CEE has estimated the cost of rewriting Independent Study courses under the four credit module to be \$350,000. CEE is also worried about the costs of decreased student access opportunities.

D. WHAT CONCERNS REGARDING OUR SPECIAL STATUS AS A LARGE URBAN UNIVERSITY NEED TO BE ADDRESSED?

The metropolitan location of the University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus yields a student profile quite unlike the traditional image of new high school graduates between the ages of 18 and 22 enrolled in a four-year undergraduate program.

Currently, 42 percent of the undergraduates are over age 21. In the major undergraduate colleges, students taking less than a full-time load range from 19 percent in the School of Management to 57 percent in the College of Education. This can be contrasted with 5 percent at the Morris campus. Over 70 percent of "day school" undergraduates are employed. Average time to the baccalaureate degree has been continually rising and is now about six years.

The following information on students on the Twin Cities campus during Fall 1984 who registered for 1 to 5 credits gives some indication of the pattern of part-time enrollment. Of the total enrollment of 44,784, 11 percent (4,904 students) fell into this category. This includes 447 Regents' Scholars.

Of this 11 percent, the Graduate School enrolled 2,198 students in this category (29.4 percent of its total enrollment); the College of Education 966 students (40 percent of its enrollment); and the School of Public Health 85 students (30 percent of its enrollment). These three colleges have the highest percentages of students registering in the 1 to 5 credit category.

The choice of attending the University under a semester or a quarter system may have greater significance for part-time students and for students enrolling in Continuing Education and Extension than for traditional students. At any rate, it remains an issue deserving of thoughtful consideration and study.

E. WHAT ARE THE REASONS FOR PREFERRING THE QUARTER OR SEMESTER SYSTEM?

The possibility of converting from one academic calendar to another raises questions about the reasons behind the selection of one or the other. If a change is to be made, there should be strong academic reasons for making such a change. For the sake of discussion we will present reasons that tend to support either the quarter or the semester system, drawn from literature on the subject, discussions with other institutions that have recently changed from the quarter to the semester system, and correspondence already received from faculty at the University.

We will divide the issues into three sections: 1) those that pertain to students; 2) those that pertain to faculty; and 3) those that may be classified as administrative in nature. Some of the issues, of course, pertain to more than one category.

Students

Those preferring the semester system believe that the longer time frame enhances learning and results in a better educational experience. It allows for increased maturation of concepts and time to integrate course material. There is also the feeling that there will be fewer incompletes. Students believe that there will be more time to develop a theoretical perspective, to impart skills in research method, and to carry out field projects. Thus, serious research papers will be possible, thereby improving graduate and undergraduate education.

The quarter system advocates believe that the shorter time frame provides more intense learning and allows less time for procrastination. They note that the quarter system allows easier access to the institution and makes changing majors easier. And while those advocating the semester system speak of the greater depth and breadth of a semester course, the quarter system proponents speak of the greater variety of courses possible for a student studying under the quarter system.

It is argued that students in the quarter system have exposure to a variety of professors. Also, it is pointed out that if an instructor is not a "good" teacher the student has to spend less time with that person. On the other hand, it is argued for the semester system that if a student happens to have a "good" instructor, the student is able to have longer exposure to that individual.

The question of what happens when a student becomes ill is approached differently from the two perspectives. The semester system allows more time for a student to recover from an illness and complete the term, while a student in the quarter system, if forced to drop out because of extended illness, stands to lose only one quarter instead of a full semester of work.

Faculty

Those favoring the semester system point out the savings in time in having to give finals and grade students only twice a year instead of three, and of engaging in major advising and counseling of students twice instead of three times a year.

Questions are raised as to whether the teaching load of faculty would be raised if a semester system were implemented. There is no reason to believe that this would happen, and based on the experience at other institutions, this has not happened.

Concerns have been raised about the ability of some departments to handle laboratory courses that are taught with a finite number of student locations if class size is increased in the conversion. This would be a concern only if two-quarter sequences were to be extended to two semesters.

Others think that the effort to undertake thorough curricular reviews would be time well spent and would result in a better educational experience.

Administrative Issues

Although the change to a semester system would necessitate expenditure in time on the part of every member of the academic community, it is clear that there will be long-range savings both in time and money because of less time in the future spent on registration, grading, textbook ordering, and other administrative activities that have to be carried out for each of the three quarters.

Cost-saving estimates are very difficult to obtain, and the other institutions that were asked about this could not provide any useful dollar figures. Some information on this is provided in this material in the section entitled "University Bulletins" and in the section entitled "Costs and Savings."

It is clear that if the whole University were to go on the same calendar, there would be tremendous monetary savings in the operation of the administrative data gathering process.

Comment

The above discussion has by no means exhausted all the issues that could be raised in regard to calendar changes. We are sure that, depending upon specific departmental and programmatic needs, others will surface as discussion of this matter ensues.

MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, April 18, 1985

3:30 p.m.

25 Law Building—Twin Cities Campus
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus
502 Darland Adm. Bldg.—Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus
Learning Resources Center Conference Room—Waseca Campus

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 219, including the President, 150 members of the faculty (including the Faculty Consultative Committee), and 68 students (including the Student Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (110) must be present. Advance notice is required for amendments to the constitution and 146 affirmative votes at one meeting or 110 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting. Advance notice is required for amendments to the bylaws and 110 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting.

Any member of the faculty and any student eligible to vote for senators shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the Senate. Only elected members or alternates, the Senate Consultative Committee and, in case of a tie, the Chair, shall be entitled to vote.

Representatives may designate any eligible alternates from their colleges, schools, or student constituencies as the alternates to serve in their places by written notice to the Clerk of the Senate prior to the commencement of any meeting of the Senate.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be available at each door of the meeting room, and members are asked to sign in. A summary of attendance for the year will be included in the minutes of the last meeting of the year.

RULES

Rules will be available at the door.

I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 14

Action (2 minutes)

II. COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, 1985-86

INFORMATION:

In the recent election to fill 1985-88 faculty vacancies on the Senate Consultative Committee, Ellen Berscheid (CLA) and Richard Goldstein (IT) were elected. Continuing members are Joseph Latterell (UMM), Cleon Meisa (UMC), Jack Merwin (Education), Paul Murphy (CLA), Irwin Rubenstein (CBS), Frank Sorauf (CLA), and Deon Stuthman (Agriculture).

III. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 1985-86

Action (5 minutes)

The constitution provides that a Vice Chair shall be elected by the Senate at its first meeting in the spring of the academic year from among its members for a term of one year starting July 1, 1985.

IV. LIBRARY COMMITTEE

LIBRARIAN APPOINTMENTS

INFORMATION:

In response to the Senate resolution of June 7, 1984, the Senate Library Committee at its meeting of October 19, 1984, approved the following motion:

Resolved, that it be made known to the academic community concerned that adjunct and/or joint appointments for librarians in academic departments and programs are a possibility.

It was also recommended that the University Libraries administration ensure that the same level of encouragement for professional development be given to the libraries' academic staff in the librarian track as the faculty track.

JOHN CHAPMAN
Chair

V. ACADEMIC FREEDOM & RESPONSIBILITY

APPEALS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The committee established its procedures for handling appeals concerning academic freedom and responsibility, based upon the precedents established in previous years. First, the Chair ordinarily receives a telephone call or other inquiry from the person who believes he or she may have a matter which would fall within the jurisdiction of the com-

Department-Specific Curricula

Currently, departments supply a given number of faculty contact hours and serve a given number of students. Repackaging a year of offerings into two semesters instead of three quarters does not by itself change the ability of departments to supply faculty contact hours. Neither should a conversion to semesters have a significant effect on the number of students attending the University, their willingness and financial ability to take classes, or their choice of majors. In short, the conversion to semesters, by itself and across the University, should not have a major impact on the number of students attending the University or their selection of majors. There may, however, be substantial impact on enrollments within specific departments.

Many specific issues of curriculum conversion depend upon which model of conversion is adopted. The discussion below assumes the adoption of Model C along with a basic four-unit semester course module similar to the current four-unit quarter course module. If there is to be no change in the number of faculty or average faculty workload, departments and colleges will need to adjust their curricula so that total course offerings are reduced by one third. The conversion of a three-quarter sequence to a two-semester sequence includes the one-third reduction. Similarly, the conversion of a one-quarter course offered every quarter to a one-semester course offered every semester also includes a one-third reduction.

Conversion of one- and two-quarter sequences is perhaps more difficult. Units will need to consider whether courses should be eliminated, expanded to one or two semesters, contracted into one semester, or restructured. For example, a sequence of one-quarter courses on individual but related topics, authors, or periods could be restructured into semester courses, each of which covers more than one topic, author, or period. Specialized low enrollment courses can be maintained with alternate year scheduling.

Special care must be taken when courses are expanded from one quarter to one semester or from two quarters to two semesters to avoid the suggestion that the University is simply inflating student credit hours. Semester student credit hours represent 50 percent more work on the part of students and a 50 percent increase in faculty commitment as compared to student credit hours under the quarter system. The greater time commitment of students and faculty must be accompanied by greater depth and/or breadth of course coverage. If material now covered in a single quarter is simply covered at a more leisurely pace under the semester system, we will be shortchanging both students and taxpayers.

Many departments are concerned about the implications under a semester system for the use of specialized facilities such as laboratories. Year long sequences with weekly labs should have few problems with conversion to the semester system, although one should note that two 14-week semesters as compared to three 10-week quarters will mean two fewer lab sessions even if total contact time is maintained. The expansion of one-quarter lab courses to one semester lab courses would require more lab time if one maintains weekly labs. In some courses, fewer lab sessions meeting every other week may be appropriate. It may also be the case that the restructuring of the curriculum necessary to meet the two-thirds constraint on conversion described above for Model C, specifically the possible conversion of a two-quarter sequence to a one-semester course, will moderate the impact on laboratory and other specialized facilities. Decreased enrollments associated with the declining number of high school graduates and/or a more concentrated focus of the University's mission may also alleviate the pressure on laboratory space.

With a four-credit semester course module, most departments should expect that the total of individual course enrollments, measured in terms of students, will decline from current numbers based on the quarter system, although enrollments in particular courses, especially ones that reflect collegiate distribution and departmental major or prerequisite requirements, may not decline. The decline in head count reflects the fact that under the semester system a full-time student would be taking eight rather than twelve courses. For example, a department that currently enrolls 100 students in each quarter of a three-quarter sequence shows an annual total of 300 students and 1,200 student credit hours. Under a semester system, the department might enroll the same 100 students in each semester for a total of 200 students and 800 student credit hours, although with 50 percent more contact time the 800 semester-based student credit hours would be equivalent to the 1,200 quarter-based student credit hours.

Conversion Model A essentially maintains the current quarter curriculum and might be expected to have the smallest impact on enrollment patterns. Other models that involve restructuring of course offerings introduce a greater degree of uncertainty regarding semester-based enrollment patterns. Many curricular decisions will have implications for other units. Prerequisites, distribution requirements, and supporting programs are areas where departments and colleges have an interest in the curriculum of other units. It is expected that many colleges and departments would use the opportunity afforded by conversion to the semester system to reexamine their whole curriculum. As a result, the conversion process must allow the necessary time for appropriate interdepartmental and intercollege consultation.

Guidelines for Conversion

The adoption of a Model A, adjusting the pace of current courses, would be largely a technical exercise. Courses meeting three times a week for ten weeks could meet twice a week for 14 weeks. For courses meeting one, two, four, or five hours a week, the arithmetic does not work out so easily. Adjustment to a semester calendar would involve either a little more or little less contact time. In these cases, there would need to be an appropriate adjustment of course material.

The University of South Florida used Model A and allowed the following adjustment of unit credit with an appropriate adjustment of course content where necessary.

Quarter Units	1	2	3	4	5	6
Semester Units	1	1 or 2	2	3	3 or 4	4

Iowa State followed Model C and issued the following broad guidelines:

Departments are strongly urged to develop semester curricula that require no more than two thirds the number of credits now required on the quarter system and in some instances slightly fewer credits should be considered to reduce the pressure on students.

Each department's total semester credit offering should be two thirds of its present total quarter system offering.

The Iowa State guidelines strongly discouraged the direct numerical conversion of courses described for South Florida.

University Bulletins

A change to the semester system would have a profound impact on the University Bulletin series. Bulletin staff produce about 30 biennial bulletins. Bulletin staff also produce University prospective student publications such as the "Viewbook," college and departmental "Briefs," and orientation handouts.

Bulletin staff feel that it might be possible to do the necessary total rewriting of the bulletins without much additional funding under certain circumstances. In a typical year only 10-40 percent of the bulletin text must be redone whereas under a semester conversion almost 100 percent would probably need to be redone. The reformatting and typesetting necessary might be accomplished if there were a lapse in the production of all bulletins. This would allow staff in departments, colleges, and the bulletin editors time to gather all appropriate new course and program information. It would allow University printing time to complete the typesetting. Funds not devoted to the production could be devoted instead to bulletin revisions.

It might be necessary to print some extra supplies of previous bulletins to carry over during the lapsed year. It would also be likely that the University should produce some kind of a reference document for advisors, colleges, and departments that could be used to track course changes from the quarter system to the semester system as was done by Iowa State and others.

Colleges, particularly those whose bulletins would be produced for the 1988-1990 biennium, would have to follow a very tight schedule for making decisions on course offerings and academic program guidelines so the data could be communicated to bulletin editors in plenty of time to complete the process. Time considerations are very important. Faculty will need as much time as possible to make curricular and program revisions. Time will be needed for faculty across the University to tie together programs in the various parts of the University. In addition, faculty will need to assess major and degree courses and requirements, delete old courses and plan new ones, rewrite course notes and tests, assess laboratory materials and facilities, and shift teaching responsibilities. The cost of this activity is difficult to estimate.

The Class Schedule would have to be used as a substitute for the bulletin during the lapsed period. Extra copies might be needed. Once a firm decision were made to convert to semesters, bulletins would have to begin warning students that a change was to be made. Communicating with prospective students during the lapsed period might be difficult, but could be accomplished if everyone had a clear idea of what the options were for informing students about offerings, and if departments and colleges followed a tight schedule for converting courses.

Transfer and External Issues

Academic calendars at all public institutions in Minnesota are now quarter calendars. Since the primary source of transfer students at the University and the primary destination of transfers from the University are to other Minnesota public institutions, it is clear that if the University switches to a semester calendar while the others do not, we must anticipate issues related to converting transfer credits from quarters to semesters and conversely. Note that this issue is in addition to the widely cited "problem" of the University's seeming penchant for denying transfer credit for courses taken elsewhere. In addition, our calendar change would also pose problems for students wishing to transfer either way for the spring quarter. However, the proportion of students currently transferring spring quarter is small so that this presents a less pressing problem than the issue raised above.

The important issue in the legislative relations area is related to the average cost funding formula. Under this formula the starting point for determining our funding is the number of FYE students we serve. Hence, any change that, correctly or not, is perceived as an attempt to inflate our credit hour production with no change in faculty workload is bound to meet resistance. Any guidelines for conversion of courses from quarters to semesters must make it clear that we will not allow simple stretching out of current quarter courses to semester length with the same credit value.

We could also suffer revenue losses in two ways even if we are not accused of credit inflation. First, credit conversions that are less than two semester credits per three quarter credits will cost us revenue through the same funding formula. Second, the experience in Florida suggests that students could take fewer (converted) credits on the average to the extent that they perceive a full load in terms of courses rather than credits.

We note, though, that the difficulties inherent in both the transfer and legislative relations issues are ameliorated if other public schools in Minnesota also convert to semester calendars. The transfer issue is clearly less thorny if other schools change. Similarly, if all schools change, the average cost funding formula will have to be revamped for all of higher education; there will only be one formula rather than two; and it is much less likely that all systems will be accused of credit inflation. However, the problem of a potential reduction in the credit loads of students or of devaluing course credits in the process of converting will still remain.

The Semester Working Group has shared information with administrative officers of the other systems of higher education in the state to keep them apprised of its work. These individuals regularly receive minutes of the committee meetings and copies of all discussion materials.

Costs and Savings Associated with the Transition to Semester

Other major institutions that changed recently to the semester system (including Penn State, Iowa State, and Berkeley) did not track the costs of making the transition from the quarter system. They could not estimate the effort associated with the programmatic and curricular revisions made by departments and faculty. They indicated that extensive work was done by their data processing departments to make needed changes but no specific record was kept of costs related to conversion. Semester conversion would necessitate the expenditure of some resources on publications used to communicate with students, other institutions, and faculty advisors about the change.

There are a number of costs associated with the transition to the semester calendar that have been identified by various University staff. Some units will have an easier time making the transition than others and may experience financial savings. In some instances no particular problems are foreseen, but time will be needed to plan necessary changes. The extensive faculty effort required in curricular reversion would be hard to tally in terms of dollars.

A number of academic units have unique systems and data processing programs that are oriented to the quarter system and may need revising. An attempt has been made below to list the support services that would be affected by a change in calendar.

Finance Departments

Administrative Data Processing. ADP sees no particular problems with the switch to semesters in the fiscal area unless the fiscal year were to be changed. Extensive costs associated with student systems are outlined under Admissions, Records, and Financial Aid.

Payroll. Changing the starting and ending dates of the academic year would necessitate altering pay schedules but should not present any major problems.

Budget Office. There seem to be no cost implications, only a concern involving tuition revenue estimation procedures that must be reviewed.

Research Administration. There would be little impact, but some appointment documents may be affected.

Housing. There would be little impact, but forecasting of dropouts from dorm rooms may be affected.

Accounting Services. There will be no impact as long as the fiscal year did not change.

Bookstores. There will be a reduction in net sales between 0 and 1/3 depending on course conversion and sequences. A longer lead time to order books may be necessary. Sales will probably go down more than costs. However, the Bookstores will have to increase staff for the rush only twice rather than three times.

Space Programming and Management. There would be no major impact, but a shift in main moving periods would be necessary.

Bursar. There could be large savings in Financial Aid check distribution. This check reduction might also help in Accounting since fewer checks will need to be produced. Group loan exit interviews will be reduced since they will have to be done in fewer time periods. Fee payment collection costs may rise since there will probably be more and extended payment periods.

MPIS. There will be no impact other than a conceptual problem explaining to legislators and others changed enrollment and credit-hour statistics.

Student Support Services

Admissions. There will be more of a peak in Admissions applications for the second semester, which may take more staff, but since there is no spring quarter, there will be more time to concentrate on fall. There could be savings if all University campuses are on the same uniform calendar in running data processing programs. Extensive work will need to be done to identify transfer problems and to smooth them out ahead of time as much as possible by working out procedures with the Community Colleges and the State University System. It is likely that some kinds of publications will need to be produced to communicate with advisors in other schools, high schools, and students.

Savings will occur in both the Orientation Office and College Student Personnel units if there are only two orientation periods per academic year.

Student Financial Aid. Packaging aid for two semesters would definitely be easier than packaging aid for three quarters. Aid check production, refund calculation, and other financial aid administrative tasks would also be substantially reduced. There are numerous ADPD programs which would have to be altered at an unknown cost before any cost savings could be realized. After this year all five campuses will be on the Student Aid Management computerized financial aid system. This system will be organized around a quarter calendar.

Registration, Student Records, and Scheduling. This is the area of largest impact within Student Support Services. Virtually all student and course record activities would need to be revised. There are approximately 200 ADPD programs that would have to be totally rewritten or modified. The changes to the programs would vary from changing title references from quarters to semesters to major revisions of some systems that are dependent on the quarter structure. All of the program changes may not be required at the time of implementation. Some may be phased in later. If a decision is made to use the semester system, a more complete analysis will have to be made to determine the time

mittee. The Chair usually asks for a brief summary of the facts which might give rise to the committee's jurisdiction. The Chair explains the various alternative procedures available for dispute resolution within the University. In principle, the individual should have sought relief at the collegiate level before asking for help from the committee. There are a number of other committees which might have jurisdiction instead of the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Appeals Committee or in addition to this committee. For example, the Judicial Committee deals with matters involving the employment and work conditions of academic employees. Most matters of academic freedom arise in the context of such employment-related issues and therefore are handled by the Judicial Committee.

If the matter apparently falls within the competence of the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Appeals Committee and the individual wishes to pursue the matter, the individual will be asked to prepare a very brief summary of the facts so that the committee can make a determination on its jurisdiction. The Chair then circulates such brief summaries to the committee and requests a relatively prompt response as to whether the matter (1) falls within the committee's jurisdiction such that a hearing panel should be appointed, (2) does not fall within the committee's jurisdiction or is so clearly lacking in merit that no further proceedings are justified, or (3) requires a meeting to discuss the issues. The Chair tabulates any such poll, circulates the results to the members of the committee, and abides by the results.

Under this procedure no appeals were submitted to the committee for consideration during the academic year 1984-85.

DAVID WEISSBRODT
Chair

VI. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT (15 minutes)

Questions shall be submitted in writing to the Clerk eight calendar days before the meeting. The Consultative Committee shall review them. Because a limited time is allotted to answering questions, it may be necessary for the committee to combine similar questions and to withhold others. The committee will also be guided by the breadth of interest

in the issue. All questions received, together with the names of the questioners, shall be distributed at the meeting. The Consultative Committee shall group questions by general topic and shall indicate those which have been forwarded for answers. The person answering a question may if he/she chooses, entertain additional questions from the floor which extend the original question.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS (15 minutes)

Please feel free to use this agenda item to comment on a topic you believe is of general interest to the Senate. The Senate is reminded that this entry in the agenda (not to be confused with the Senate's "Questions to the President") may be used to raise specific issues, concerns and/or ideas of general interest. A motion is not required. As much as anything, the Business and Rules Committee wishes to remind the Senate that all ideas presented to the body need not flow from a committee.

IX. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS

WILLIAM A. KLEINHENZ
1921-1985
WALLACE F. WHITE
1908-1985

X. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE **Thursday, April 18, 1985** (immediately following the University Senate meeting)

The Senate constitution provides that all members of the faculty who hold regular appointment as defined in the *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure* may be present at Faculty Senate meetings and shall be entitled to speak and to offer motions for Faculty Senate action. Only elected faculty members (or their designated alternates) shall be entitled to vote.

I. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE **SEMESTER SYSTEM** (15 minutes)

MOTION:

That the question of change to a semester system be submitted to a vote of the faculty as a whole. Be it resolved that the present state of mind of the Faculty Senate would be to not approve the change unless the faculty vote reaches a 60 percent or greater majority in favor of the change.

INFORMATION:

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs believes that a change to a semester system should not be made unless the reasons for the change are considerably stronger than those for retaining the quarter system. Since every faculty member is likely to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of the respective systems differently, a vote of the faculty is the most reasonable, clear, and reliable way to determine the collective faculty judgment of the relative merits and desirability of the two systems.

THOMAS CLAYTON
Chair

II. TENURE COMMITTEE **TENURE REGULATIONS**

INFORMATION:

The Board of Regents has approved the new tenure code, in the form recommended by the Faculty Senate in January. It will take effect July 1. Printed copies will be made available to all faculty members by late in spring quarter.

In the final Senate session considering the new tenure code, the Senate instructed the Tenure Committee to adopt an interpretation of Section 7.11, dealing with the criteria for achieving tenure. The Committee held a public hearing on that issue on March 15, and has recommended the following official interpretation to the Board of Regents:

Interpretation of § 7.11

The use of any factor other than teaching, research, and service in making the decision about a probationary faculty member must be specifically stated and justified at the time of the decision. This rule applies both when that factor is a criterion for judging the candidate's progress and when it is an element in establishing or modifying the standard which the faculty member should achieve.

A change in the program of a unit or college may be used as a factor in a decision only when the change has been adopted in accordance with the established procedures of the University, after consultation as required by those procedures. It must be explicitly identified. If such changes affect the prospects of probationary faculty members to achieve tenure, the faculty members should be given the earliest possible notice of the potential impact of such changes.

We anticipate that the Board of Regents will adopt the interpretation and that it will also be effective July 1.

The Committee is currently considering a set of procedural rules to guide departments and colleges in the process of granting tenure. These rules are required by the new code and will replace the Koffler-Ibele memorandum, which has been in use for several years.

FRED L. MORRISON
Chair

III. ADJOURNMENT